THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXIV FEBRUARY, 1937 No. 200

EDITORIAL

The shortness this year of the Epiphany season may be perhaps used as a symbol of the fact that it is this year more than ever necessary to return at once from the contemplation of the manifested Hope to the remembrance of existing facts. There is, as there always must be, just time enough to dwell on the gift of salvation, and then we are at once reminded that the created world is a stage into the drama of which mixed motives have broken. The Creator, it seems, has conceded a certain initiative to His characters. They have misused their liberty. They have taken the plot into their teeth and mangled it. The result is that they are not themselves fulfilling their vocation. The players who strut to and fro before the wondering eyes of the angel audience, alternately weeping and applauding, are battered and disfigured versions of the true image, the Perfect Player.

We are reminded of this on Quinquagesima in the gentlest and most charitable way. In three days we are going to be summoned to take ourselves in hand and use a severe regimen of self-discipline. It is very severe. The Commination does not hesitate to use the strongest language. It is a shock to those who had not realized that the Church takes sin seriously But in the meantime on Quinquagesima the lesson is indicated without any hardness. We learn that the divine method is pure love, the only instrument which "never faileth," and that the cry, "Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me," is both heard and answered. So Ash Wednesday and Lent are not simply a hard discipline, a punishment inflicted from without upon reluctant criminals. "What is called the judgment of God," said R. C. Moberly, "upon sin is but the gradual necessary development, in the consistent sinner, of what sin inherently is. . . . Directly disgrace and punishment from without begin to be no longer inflictions merely from without,

directly they begin to be taken over and assimilated within, the man has begun to go over (as it were) from the side of his sin to the side of the condemnation of his sin. And if his penitence should be all that we are able in imagination to conceive its being, behold, the punishment which he suffers—no longer now as merely passive suffering, but as a subjective homage, as a willing sacrifice within the soul—is transfigured, and touched with something of the light of what we may dare to call atoning satisfaction. Not the suffering in itself, but the inward acceptance of the suffering; the homage to righteousness which is offered as suffering; the self-consecration to sacrifice; this, so far as it is true, is a real approach towards re-identification of self, in sacrifice, with righteousness" (*Atonement and Personality*, pp. 15, 19).

That is to say, if, before Lent begins, we can convince ourselves that it is not to be the reluctant acceptance of an externally imposed correction, but the willing, even joyful expression of a personal penitence, its difficulty will disappear. It will be no more difficult than it is, when the Confession has once been duly said, to say the Prayer of Humble Access. The language is still penitential and self-accusing, but the setting is a setting of Approach and Trust and Love.

This, then, is Lent. But lest we should be tempted to suppose that this is all, we are to see later that human repentance does not undo sin. Only one thing can undo sin, and that is an Act of God. It is good that, as the Master draws near to Gethsemane, He should be surrounded by a group of disciples, some near, some not so near. But the failure even of those who are nearest to achieve anything that makes any difference is a reminder that, like the Egyptians, we "are men, and not God, and our horses are flesh, and not spirit." We are not saving the world, we are not even saving our own souls, by our penitence. When Gethsemane passes into Calvary, we can stand by, we can moisten the ground with tears, we can separate ourselves from some of the grosser and more obvious causes of the Tragedy, the cruelty, the treachery, the envy, that helped to bring it about. But the consciousness of subtler things like pride and selfishness existing in ourselves all the time is a proof that in the last resort He must tread the winepress alone, and of the people there can be none with Him. In the minor conflicts of life the more chivalrous of the spectators want to help. They cannot bear to be doing nothing. But in the supreme issues even of earthly life there is often nothing to be done. A man, when his wife is travailing with child,

a mother when her child is at the crisis of pneumonia, can do nothing. Translate this from the temporal to the eternal, make the issue not single but universal, let the stake be not the survival of an individual but the redemption of a world, and it is plain that " Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it."

But this is not everything. It may be plain enough that only a divine hand can disentangle the confusion of the world. But we must also be sure that this essential divine capacity, for which there is no imaginable substitute, is in our Lord. Is the Gospel not merely true but the only thing that matters ? For, if it is not the Truth itself, it is not true at all. The claim that our Lord makes is far greater than of any other master, before or since. It is infinite. What are His credentials ? Is He a ruler of men ? Is He a master of affairs ? Is He a mystic, with a strange knowledge of the unseen world, suggesting that He " has been there, and knows " ? Yes, there is something of all this. He is imperious, He does understand human nature, and He has knowledge of the unseen. But these things are not His essential secret.

His secret is that looking into His eyes we see something that no other eyes contain. An earthly ruler dominates because he is a political genius, or because he is an orator, or because he happens to be a convenient symbol for a nation, a class or a group. Mystics impress because they have a surprising knowledge of things that are hidden from most. But in our Lord is seen readiness to meet the concentrated opposition of diabolical hatred, worldly indifference and fleshly brutality, together with the heart-breaking disappointment of incompetence and disloyalty in friends, and to rely on one weapon only. That is what gives the Cross its value, and makes it the centre of the history of the world. It is love divinely perfect and perfectly divine. There has never been a battle like this. The young David slew Goliath with a single stone, but a stone is an earthly weapon. Many men have saved their lives in danger by being fearless, but fearlessness is a self-contained, even in a sense a negative, virtue. Love, which was the sole weapon of the Crucified, reaches out all round and transforms its environment. It was a weapon of a hitherto little-used kind, and it was used here uncompromisingly, unreservedly by the Master of " more than twelve legions of angels." That is why we call the day Good Friday, and the victim Christus Victor.

As every reader of THEOLOGY is well aware, the matter of the relationship of Church, Community and State is the most urgent, and also the most baffling, of contemporary problems. Russia began it. Germany, no whit less thorough-going, but with a different starting-point and a different aim, has produced an entirely fresh version of it. Italy, with a more homogeneous Christianity than that of Germany, is developing under the appearance of a concordat what may prove the most dangerous form of Erastianism. Those who read Dr. J. H. Oldham's pamphlet, *Church, Community and State*, a year ago will remember how acutely he analyzed the Christian doctrine of personality, and shewed that it supplied just what was needed. The Christian doctrine is that each human personality, made in God's image, redeemed by Christ, has an infinite value. This is the true version of what the old "Manchester" economics were trying in a competitive and brutal way to assert. On the other hand, these personalities, with their values, will only realize themselves, will only come to their full stature as they are grouped in a fellowship. Christianity does not know anything about "mere individuals." There are, in the complete sense of the word, no such things. They do not exist. There are only members, actual or potential, of the Body of Christ. This is the true version of the mass-theories, national or otherwise, which have been put forward of late in reaction from the old, excessive individualism.

An International Conference at Oxford, July 12-26, to which there will come 300 delegates from all parts of the globe, together with some nominated experts and some representatives of youth, will consider the bearing of the Christian Gospel on the state of the world. Those who are organizing the Conference are aware of the urgency of the situation. They know, they are even haunted by the knowledge, that their Conference may never take place at all because the world we live in may have burst into destructive and suicidal fragments before next July. But they believe that amid the utter and absolute chaos of contemporary secular ideas, the only comparatively confused thinking and the only relative uncertainty of Christian people may, with good will, be to some extent resolved. If the thought of the delegates can manifest itself as genuinely Christian thought, Christ-centred, Spirit-guided, it will commend itself to very many who are waiting to hear the watchman announce some tidings of the night. At present the Church is not counting for much among the voices which determine the course of affairs. That would not matter if it were because the Church

has been so utterly faithful to the Master that it has precipitated persecution of the noblest kind. But it is on the whole because the Church seems human, like any other corporation, but, as some think, not so good as many. The Church has not had a clear word of God to declare. Yet there are very many who are still waiting for such a word. It will not be, perhaps it cannot be, a very neat and tidy message. Easy solutions would be rightly suspect. The Oxford Conference will probably not be able to say, for example: "The Christian people here assembled are agreed on the following twelve propositions about war." But if they can report that some believe that war is to be wholly repudiated, as a thing that is in 1937 and forever impossible, and that others believe that war cannot yet be wholly repudiated, and the reasons given for both these convictions clearly proceed from a sincere examination of the purpose of Christ for mankind, the manifesto will have great value. If a Conference, at which Nazis and Communists are both present, can discuss in a constructive way the sort of authority which the Christian Church has over the consciences of all its members, and can find some ultimate sanction beyond that of either race or class or any other human thing, a way into the future will have been opened out.

The Oxford Conference will be followed by another two weeks at Edinburgh. The overseas delegates will be the same, the home delegates for the most part different. The programme at Edinburgh will be more strictly theological. We hope to say something about it next month.

DISTINCTIVE MOMENTS IN THE REVELATION OF THE SUPERNATURAL

THERE is no approach to the problem of the supernatural without a realization that nature itself is a problem. People sometimes seem to speak as though all were plain sailing, or, at least, that there were no bad shoals, in the course of a voyage of discovery into the natural order. Indeed, it might almost be said that for such folk the whole idea of a voyage of discovery is nonsense. Where this temper of mind is in possession, any conception of the supernatural may well arouse feelings of irritation as a superfluity and sophistication which introduces unnecessary complications into what otherwise would be the orderly processes of thought. The man who, if I may so interpret his attitude, weighed the catechism of the Church of England in the balances and found it wanting, because it told him that God had made him, whereas he knew that he had been made by the laws of nature, is an instance in point, perhaps a trifle crude but not therefore irrelevant.

But, in truth, this supposed simplicity and intelligibility of the natural order is much more apparent than real. That is clear the moment you begin to ask questions. Of course nothing is more tiresome than the habit of asking questions about things that sensible men are agreed in finding perfectly perspicuous. It was not the fault of the Athenian jurymen if Socrates failed to grasp that fact. But let us be rather stimulated than deterred by his example. So long as man retains the power to ask the right questions his heritage of reason and conscience will survive the mechanizations of life which threaten him through his environment.

Consider, then, the difficulties which should prevent all easy assumptions as to the character of the natural order. First, there are the difficulties which arise on the physical side, concerning matter. The very way in which, with excusable conventionality, I phrase the sentence is illuminating in this connection. For what is it that we speak of when we use such words as "physical" and "matter"? That question has often been asked in various ways and we know that the great Dr. Johnson did not refute Berkeley by kicking a stone. But the special interest of the question today is that it is asked from the side not of metaphysics but of science. It is physics, not metaphysics, which has led to the disappearance of matter as the ordinary man understands it into mathematical symbols. Doubtless there is room for plenty of controversy. We mere

layfolk in such subjects must not assume that a last word has been said. But it seems to me that recent researches have as their result that we know both more and less about the physical order: more, in so far as experiments which have come out to definite results have meant a filling in of what Sir Arthur Eddington calls the " puzzle-picture " at which scientists are working. Less, inasmuch as the analysis of matter has left us with a contrast between the physical universe as it appears and as it really is which both enables us to appreciate Sir Arthur's phrase, " the essential unknownness of the fundamental entities of physics," and to feel that the physical universe is elusive in a manner which commonsense men and commonsense materialists of the nineteenth century never realized.

So much for the first problem that the natural order suggests. The second is more directly philosophical, and concerns not the structure of matter but the origin of the world and the relation of the world to time. This problem of time is another old story, but it is always up to date, and is an excellent corrective for any idea that in our thinking about the world the road is clear of obstacles and that we can track back the process of things to their beginnings. But that is exactly what we cannot do: we never get near the beginning of things, we never approach to a point where a signpost tells us that here the world and time began. There can't be such a signpost: if there were one we should at once ask what was on the other side of it, and to answer, " Nothing," makes no sense at all. But equally inconceivable is an infinite regress. The fact is that the natural order as we know it involves the time series, but the time series as something which has a beginning out of that which is not time, or as something which has no beginning, is alike unthinkable. I want to press this point because it is sometimes assumed that those who assert the existence of a supernatural order along with, in whatever relation it may stand to, the natural order are complicating a situation which in other respects can be explored from end to end. The business of time is enough to expose the vanity of this notion, and it is interesting to note that the most intractable fact in human nature which the materialist has to meet is that of memory, and the problem of memory is one aspect of the problem of time.

The last point to which I wish to refer in this connection is that which concerns the significance of values and the judgment of values. Now, there has been much talk of value in philosophical and religious literature in recent years. Especially have we been familiarized with the three fundamental

values of truth, beauty, and goodness. And I suppose that many people would say that these values both represent the climax of the natural order, and that there is no need of any relating of them to a supernatural order for their accrediting. But what impresses me is the fact that while they arise within the natural order, they are the source of great disturbance of thought when we try to fit them into the natural order. If we say that the values are "real" in a way that sets them by themselves, what precisely do we mean by that? Do we mean that they are eternal, independent of all that belongs to the physical structure of things and indestructible whatever else may be destroyed? Yet the values exist in relation to a subject who apprehends them. Can we speak of the values as permanent apart from the permanence of mankind, in which, so far as this world is concerned, we have no right to believe? I would refer you to the discussion of the question in Dr. Inges' book *God and the Astronomers*. The puzzle as I see it is this, that in connection with value the natural order appears at its most objective and also at its most subjective. I find it hard not to think of the values as more certainly real than the multiplication table. Probably my way of putting it is technically wrong, but my meaning is that the moral law demands our reverence, that it is a more sacred thing than any mathematically valid law of which we can have knowledge. In other words, one may speak disrespectfully of the equator but not of the eighth commandment, as readers of the first story in *The Innocence of Father Brown* know very well. And yet how easily one passes from the objective to the subjective: as one changes over from that aspect of the universe in which one is continually dealing with measurements to that in which one is dealing with values, the area of disagreement is always enlarging, as the apprehending subject becomes more and more important. We may ask, "What *is* truth or beauty or goodness?" with a proper feeling that here is a difficult problem, as we should not ask, "What is the binomial theorem or the second law of thermo-dynamics?" Art is particularly interesting in this connection. It's all very well for Browning to put an end to wrangling with the words, "But we musicians know." If they know what is beautiful in music, as the rest of us don't (and I wouldn't for a moment challenge the fact), nevertheless their expression is varied to such an extent that the ideal beauty in music, the beautiful in itself, seems to recede rather than to be brought nearer. The same reflections arise as to the arts of painting and sculpture. Again, what is implied if we say that great art gives insight into the meaning of the universe, which is equivalent to saying that through art we come

in contact with the truth of things? Mr. Dover Wilson, writing on King Lear in his book *The Essential Shakespeare*, remarks of the final scene that whereas "what the meaning of Life may be we know no more than before," yet that when we remember that the universe contains Lear and Cordelia, "the possibility of such souls may even be a clue to its meaning": and a little later on he commits himself to the statement that the meaning of *King Lear* and the meaning of the universe "are the same." It may be so, and we may well think on grounds that seem to us satisfactory that this is the case: but if the values represented by the story of Lear and Cordelia are not permanent values, if they vanish from the natural order and do not find themselves validated in any other order, I do not understand how that is so. I do not see how the values give us the meaning of the universe unless we can think of them as eternal, nor how we can think of them as eternal unless we can assert their permanence, nor how we can assert their permanence unless we can say with Windelband, whom Inge quotes, that "they have their foundation in a higher spiritual reality, above the changing interests of the times." But the natural order and the progress of the times are bound up with one another: which leads me to the view that if there is not a higher spiritual reality which is in the fullest sense independent of the natural order, the values do not supply the key to the universe, but only a certain temporary and vanishing aspect thereof.

The problem of the natural order might truly be described as the problem of man. It is man, who is part of that order, who is so disturbing an element in that order. Man does not so much provide a final harmony as a permanent discord. That is why humanism as a philosophy of life is so unsatisfactory. However much man endeavours to fit himself into the order of things into which he has come, the likelihood of his ever doing so is most unpromising. It would be more hopeful if man could dehumanize himself and cease to think of himself as a subject over against all else in the natural order: but to do so would mean the forfeiting of his birthright and the evacuating of the place which is his and his alone. But if man really became convinced that there is no objective meaning or purpose in the universe, and that all the talk about such purpose in which man has indulged merely represents a human wish that things should be so, it is very doubtful whether the high idealism which makes Lippmann's *Preface to Morals* so fine a book would prove itself to possess any staying-power. If I do not believe that mankind will ever come to this pessimistic conclusion it is because I doubt whether man, who belongs to the supernatural order just as he does to the natural order, will be guilty

of the apostasy which would be involved in a repudiation of his membership thereof.

Hence I find myself reaching this conclusion: If there be no other order to claim our attention except that order of nature to which we unquestionably belong, nature remains a riddle to which there is no answer, or, if we prefer to put it so, whatever answers are given are interpretations which cannot be regarded as "true" in the way in which an answer to a mathematical problem can be affirmed to be "true." And though man's increasing knowledge, and his artistic and ethical activities, mean an enrichment of man himself and of the natural order within which they are exercised, they do not lead to any real transcendence of that order on the part of man. Man can stake out a limited independence of his own (that is, assuming that the notion of human freedom is not an illusion), but he cannot prevent his own annihilation. So far as the natural order goes, the last word does not rest with him who can speak it but with that which cannot. If truth belongs to naturalism and humanism, the pessimists seem to me to be more in the right than any other people. Whereon the tendency to suicide among the Stoics is a commentary.

And now we come in sight of the significance of the supernatural order. Such an order, if it exists, means the liberation of man from that closed circle of existence which is his so long as the natural order appears as the only one with which he can have any dealings, or, put objectively, as the only one which has any reality. He no longer, then, needs to reject the whole idea of final causes. The notion of a purposeful activity which includes both the world and himself comes to life. And now, just because he no longer asks of this world more than this world can ever give, the strain between the world and himself passes out of his life. For that strain arises out of the belief that the natural order as self-existent is, in respect of that fundamental fact, superior to him, the individual man, who comes and goes; whereas at the same time, he cannot but feel himself to be greater than the whole of that order, when conceived of with himself subtracted from it; greater in virtue of his various capacities, whereby he is the subject and all else the object, a relation which can never be reversed. As the Archbishop of York put it in one of his addresses to members of the University of Oxford with reference to the supposition that the universe is so vast that man cannot matter very much in it: "Yet I know the stars are there, and if they are nothing more than Sir James Jeans has found out about them, they do not know that I am here. I beat the stars." As he points out, size does not settle the question, since "he who measures

is greater than that which he measures, even though his body is so much smaller." Nevertheless this consciousness of superiority is a poor thing, indeed it mocks man, if the order which cannot think or purpose or love, lasts on while man who can do all these things is doomed to perish for ever.

It is as man has faith in the God on whom he and the world depend, the God who is the End for whom he and the world exist, as well as the God to whom they owe their origin, that the tension between himself and the order of nature is resolved. In his dependence upon God, in his relation to a supernatural order, which is in no way controlled by the order of this world, he finds a freedom which is not in contrast with an otherwise mechanically operative universe. The highest values which man knows, values that form the standard and inspiration of his action, become a clue to the ultimate nature of reality. All that challenges those values, and especially death, which is continually setting a limit to their expression in human lives, are manifested as lacking the power to win more than temporary victories. It is, I think, important to note that the security which man can possess in God is quite absent from a religion which dispenses with the idea of the personal God. In such a religion there can be no place for a victory of man over the cosmic order in which his life is set. Whatever reconciliation he may be able to effect between himself and it, it must be a reconciliation based upon submission, not upon triumph. He can, of course, regard it as an enemy and refuse any inner submission:

> Beneath the bludgeonings of fate,
> My head is bloody but unbowed.

But then there has been no reconciliation. It is as he believes in God and not otherwise that man can confront all that is at odds with him, all that threatens both his well-being and his being, and make answer in the words, "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors": and his security at this point rests upon the closing words of the Apostle's assurance, "through Him that loved us." It is the tragic isolation of a love which looks for a love prevenient to itself, a love which moves the sun and all the stars, and does not, cannot find it, which makes religion without God so impoverished a substitute for religious reality. This substitute-religion is, indeed, morality touched by emotion. That it may bring peace of mind and even strength of will to him who practises it I would not deny. Viewed from the human side, that may come along many different paths of life: viewed from the divine side, we can put no limits to the gifts which God may give to those who do not believe in Him as well

as to those who do. But one thing this religion cannot be—a gospel of love, eternal and victorious. I do not know what hymns might be sung at gatherings of those who should respond to that devotional impulse which men in their religious ways have both fostered and expressed, while in their religion they have no place for faith in God. But, with however much adaptation, I do not see how they could sing the hymn whose first line is, "O Love that will not let me go." Christians can sing it because they believe that the order of love is eternal, that it has its ground in the nature and life of God, and that the destiny which God would have man achieve is one that means the fullest harmony between man and that order of love whereof human nature is capable. And they believe that if that achievement comes to pass, as it comes to pass in this instance and that, it is the fruit of the divine love itself, the love which has been revealed, the love which is God self-revealing, from point to point, in creation and redemption and sanctification, and making for itself a home in the heart of man, the love which in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is manifested as the truth of God in the eternal movement of the divine life, and in the outward movement of that life towards that which is not God but knows one supreme need—the need of God. It is the whole creation which can find its rest in God alone.

There is a striking remark by Dr. Oman in his massive work, *The Natural and the Supernatural.* He says that "the Supernatural must be inquired into as like the Natural, as a world in which we live and move and have our being, if it is to be inquired into with profit," and later he makes clear what he implies by this use of the text in Acts xviii. when he affirms that the Supernatural, like the Natural, is known only by direct experience. This brings up the question of the accessibility of the supernatural and the manner in which it is apprehended, which is obviously an aspect of the problem of knowledge. If, as Dr. Oman says, the Supernatural, according to his use of the term, means the world which has values that stir the sense of the holy and demand to be esteemed as sacred, the relation in which we stand to it, however immediate that relation be, does not by itself determine anything as to the supernatural facts and realities with which the world of values is bound up, nor as to our acquaintance with those facts and realities. As far as I can see, the Supernatural, in his sense, might be compatible with a reading of fact and reality quite different from what is asserted in Christian theology. Granted that through our sense of the holy we have knowledge of the Supernatural, the really critical problem concerns not our relation to it, important though that is, but what is that super-

natural reality with which we are in relation? It is to that question, "What?" that Christian theology claims to give the answer, and in doing so it points to certain events or moments which, while they lie within the natural order, are moments of revelation. Through them and in them the supernatural breaks through. But we must not suppose that this breaking through is one that carries with it the proof of its own nature. Revelation cannot be known for what it is apart from faith. Just as only God gives the revelation so only He knows it. If the supernatural could not be denied it would mean that we no longer walked by faith but already by sight. And because revelation speaks to faith, there can be no apologetic which enables the need of faith to be side-tracked. There is a limit to what is possible through "Christian evidences." That Karl Barth, and that extraordinary predecessor of his, the Dane Soren Kierkegaard, have erred in making the limit into a theological principle of the first order is, I think, certainly the case. Kierkegaard's idea of God and Christ and the Gospel as the Absolute Paradox, of Christ as the One who, in the words of Kierkegaard's biographer and interpreter, Dr. Allen, "creates difficulties that he may thereby enhance faith," is one that makes a serious standard of theological approach out of the famous rhetoric of Tertullian, "credibile est quia ineptum est, . . . certum est quia impossibile est" (it is credible because it is absurd, it is certain because it is impossible). But faith is not a *blind* leap into the dark or over a precipice, and there is too much of that conception of faith in Kierkegaard and not a little of it in Barth. Dr. Selbie's criticism is to the point: "It takes two to make a revelation, and it is no use talking to the deaf." Nevertheless no apologetic amounts to a demonstration. Butler believed in reason as fully as Kierkegaard did not: but Butler knew quite well that reason could never get you the whole way, and that Christianity was not only, according to the notable title of one of his chapters, "A Scheme Imperfectly Apprehended," but that in this present order of things that must always be so. God's revelation does not coerce: the Gospel sayings, "He that hath ears to hear let him hear," "If they believe not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead," come as a commentary upon any notion of revelation as something in which God gives men more than the opportunity of faith. Of course, when one says that one is saying also, "the opportunity for disbelief." But just as faith cannot pass into demonstration so unbelief cannot pass into disproof. Unbelief is not an affair of sight any more than faith is. I have read with much interest the remark of Mr. Leslie Weheart-

head, the gifted new minister of the City Temple, that young students at the University of Leeds have told him that if he had had a scientific education he would not accept as gospel those things which the Churches believed. Here it is assumed that the supernatural order is subject to tests which arise in connection with the natural order. But that is precisely one of the points at issue, and to assume that such tests can be applied in relation to an order which *ex hypothesi* differs qualitatively from that order of nature with which science is concerned is a *petitio principii*.

So we come to those occasions or events which are so many pointers in the direction of the supernatural. In them there is always something of the nature of a challenge. The Christian allows that in each case there is the possibility of a naturalistic reading of the text, but he claims that in each case that reading has to meet a direct challenge. He refuses to admit that he is putting a strained interpretation on what is in itself a plain text that supports the idea of the self-sufficiency of the natural order.

First, then, I go back to the very beginnings. The fact of existence is at the same time the mystery of existence. In his book *Von Hugel and the Supernatural*, Dr. Dakin speaks of von Hugel believing that in "the awareness of the infinite" he caught an intimation of the supernatural. That is to approach the matter from the subjective side, from an impression which comes to a man. In no way do I quarrel with that way of putting things when I say that to me the fact of existence, which is itself impossible to be conceived of as finite, suggests an order transcendent to the order of this or any other world that can be analyzed or measured, and thereby manifested as part of a natural order. Westcott made the phrase "the Gospel of creation." But it is not, as it seems to me, possible to stop there. Creation is a stage beyond existence; it implies a passive voice; when one speaks of creation one is thinking of that which has been created. And there you touch the finite. But as the ground of creation there is that which is. The dilemma into which, as we saw, naturalism is shut up becomes a pointer towards a supernatural order which, through being itself beyond the natural order to which the conceptions of time and creation are relevant, becomes the source of that order. Of course the self-existence of God is no more imaginable than is the self-existence of the natural order. But the independence which faith discerns in God is more intelligible than the independence of an order which continually speaks of its dependence on that which goes before in the succession of time. No new views of the world, of whatever

kind they be, appear to me to have the smallest possibility of deflecting this pointer from its direction towards a supernatural order.

It is the order of nature itself rather than any characteristic of it which finds its best explanation in supernature, though many would lay stress on particular aspects of nature, such as the beauty which is manifested in it, or on the appearance of man within nature. On the element of discord which through man is introduced into the natural order I have already laid stress, and within the order I do not see how that discord can ever be converted into a harmony. This discord may therefore have the value of a pointer, in so far as we find it hard to believe that such a being as man is no more than a temporary discord in the universe. But there is, as I see it, a certain indirectness about this pointer. Human life and history are not evacuated of all value in the absence of the supernatural, tragic though its final outcome may appear; nor can we say with confidence that it would have been better that man should have never been brought to birth through the working of natural processes, were it impossible to believe that the heritage of eternity may be his.

But within the history of man there are facts which derive their whole meaning from a relation to the supernatural. That is, if the supernatural is an illusion, it would have been better that they should never have appeared, since their entire direction is towards the supernatural, and they challenge in the most direct way all ideas of the sufficiency of the natural order and of its independence of anything beyond itself. If the account which these facts give of themselves is true, we must say that through them there has come a revelation of a transcendental reality. The facts to which I refer are Israel, the Person of Christ, and the Christian Church, and it is with the content of those facts that I am concerned.

The history of Israel in itself is of very little importance as a historical phenomenon. As a nation it had its brief period of worldly success and splendour; but when one compares it with the great nations of antiquity, with Assyria and Egypt and Persia and so on, it inevitably strikes one as a nation of limited power and precarious existence. It is of not much more account as a factor in the development of history than surrounding nations such as Edom and Moab, of which one may say that their memorial is perished with them. Yet Israel lives on in the modern world as far greater peoples than itself do not. And of that the secret is to be found in that literature which is in various ways the interpretation of the nation's history. The Old Testament is a record which sets upon Israel the sign

that points to the divine purpose which uses Israel for ends with which the nation is called to co-operate. Practically everything that we know about Israel has come down to us as a result of the conviction of Israel's religious standing to which the Prophets and the Law bear witness.

It is the action of God in history that is proclaimed. Of course we cannot limit the divine purpose or the divine action to one section of history, nor did the prophets, who are specially relevant in this connection, desire to do so. But the notion of history as a field in which God has His purposes, in which He calls nations even as He calls individuals, is one that is underlined in the Old Testament as nowhere else. We have only to think of the gap that there would be if our heritage from the ancient world did not include the Old Testament to realize that in its writings, and the interpretation of life that they offer, we come face to face with something to which there is no parallel. For here we have no general idea of God such as the philosophers at times adumbrated, and equally no particular adaptation of the belief in gods of nature and of nations which is familiar to students of the history of religion. Both in the objective character of the message and in the assurance with which the message is given the Old Testament has a place of its own. It is one long testimony to the reality of the supernatural, though to put it in that way suggests a far more abstract interest in the divine than is the mark of the literature. The divine, in the neuter, might be the concern of a Greek thinker; the Hebrew prophet or writer or legislator was sure that he and his nation were the concern of the living God, that they lived under the eye of One who was the great Taskmaster but also the Shepherd of His people. Life in this world, so runs the Old Testament message, is lived under the judgment and mercy of God. Here, then, if we refuse to account its glowing faith, which had indeed been tried in the furnace of experience, as the most pathetic of fallacies, is the truth of revelation.

But the Old Testament is an unfinished literature. It is ever looking forward, but to what? With no great precision is that question answered in its pages: yet its gaze is towards an age and an order in which there will be a closer union between God and His people than the chequered history of Israel had as yet been able to show. We speak of the Messianic expectation, and that phrase may stand if we do not read too definite a conception of a Messiah into it. Anyhow, it was to the further unveiling of God's purposes, to the revelation of that which He still had in store for His people, to which prophets and psalmists looked beyond the present; and if not beyond the world, yet to a world itself in some way regenerated.

The question mark set against that expectation of a fulfilment is the Person of Jesus Christ. Here, even more than in the case of Israel, the choice must be made—for or against revelation. To regard Jesus as just a stage in human development towards true religion is not to take Him seriously. If that was all He was, that is not what He held Himself to be. If, indeed, He is to be regarded as a stage in a development it is a stage in a false development, for He (not simply His followers' thoughts about Him) must be held, in that case, to have thrown the religious thoughts and hopes of men on to wrong lines. No: either He is a pointer, the pointer towards God and the supernatural, and more than that, since that to which He points is present in Him, or He is the sign of the impossibility of truth in human religion, since if He is wrong, to what person and to what tendencies shall we look for rightness? If you think that is over-confident, at least it will be true that if in Jesus the revelation has not come, the army of humanity on its religious march has been thrown out of step through Him to such an extent that it is doubtful if it can ever recover. To recover from the impact of Jesus could hardly be done without the forgetting of Him, and how is such forgetfulness to be achieved, that is, if man still cares about religion? But as the sign of God's revelation His relation to that army on the march is such as Brunner has described in his book *The Word and the World*. As the army marches, there are leaders and pioneers who point to a spot above them all, not on the same plane as the human route of march:

> "And now this approaching point of light, to which they direct attention, touches the earth and comes to meet the advancing army, and behold! it is a man. Not a man out of the army seeking salvation, but One who comes alone to meet the marching army, to give what they seek. And now some recognize Him; it is He who is what the prophets had said, He whom, perhaps imperfectly and indistinctly, they saw coming. He is the Saviour."

The relation of the New Testament to the Person of Christ as the One in whom God had revealed Himself has its points of comparison with the Old Testament in relation to Israel, the People of God. But there is this great difference. God's revelation as we find it in the Old Testament is a revelation to Israel: but His revelation as we find it in the New Testament is not a revelation to Christ, but through and in Him. God reveals Himself in Christ, and Christ, in His Person, is the revelation of God. And that revelation moves onwards to its climax in the cross and the resurrection. The cross is indeed in the fullest sense the crucial moment, since the denial of revelation there would mean the impossibility of maintaining it elsewhere. But if the challenge of the Cross to us to answer

yes or no to the question which is as surely set up with it as the Cross itself was set up, the question whether it means the revelation of God brought to its highest earthly perfection, is answered yes, then there is for us such an unveiling of the supernatural as we could never have conceived and should have accounted it folly and worse to hope for. Who would dare to contemplate the possibility of One who as the true Son of the Father was Himself true God suffering and dying upon an earthly Cross ?

The Person of Christ is for the Christian the climax but not the cessation of the revelation of the supernatural, as that supernatural is witnessed to in facts which have their place in the natural order. On the contrary, Christ is for him the beginning of an unveiling of a reality which comes to man from above. The question, " From heaven or of men ?" is answered in the same way whether it be asked of Christ or of the Church.

Of all earthly societies it may be asked: " Are they worth while ? Do they serve any useful purpose ?" To all such questions the answer must be yes or no, according as they are or are not judged to embody and preserve certain values which make for life's well-being. That well-being is, of course, to be discerned in more ways than one. We may think of ethics and æsthetics, of politics and economics. Now, the peculiarity of the Church is that its own account of its existence does not affirm primarily its worth for a well-being that falls within the sphere of this life. However true it may possibly be that its presence in the world has particular consequences of value for the ordering of life in the here and now, that is not a vindication of its existence—except for those who deny the primary object of what the Church believes to be the purpose of its existence. For that purpose looks directly beyond the horizons of the order of this world. The claim of the Church is that it is a supernatural creation, placed in this world to protest that this world is not man's only and supreme interest. Not in the least does this mean that the Church has no vocation from God to work with recreative and regenerative effects upon our earthly life. But always its first call is to remember a pattern shown to it in the Mount, so that the shadows and images of that life may reflect more adequately the realities of the supernatural Kingdom of God. And while it may be in no small measure the Church's fault if that reflection is dim, if men are in danger of mistaking mere Brocken-gespenster for the true ideals that they should follow, nevertheless the success of the Church in the world is not one of the irreversible promises of God.

The Church's distinctive witness is given in all that stands in the most direct relation to the reality of the supernatural, in its worship, particularly in those sacraments which are the continual affirmation of the truth of its Lord's incarnation and atoning death and triumphant resurrection, in those callings to the ministry and the task of missionary evangelization and the religious life which the world outside the Church must hold to be futile apart from their possible useful reactions in the promotion of this-worldly goods, in the lives based upon and expressing the faith and hope and love which can find their satisfaction only in God and His Kingdom. Such witness is not to a remote supernatural, but to a supernatural, transcendent indeed, and independent of the ebb and flow of the world's tides, yet immanent within the natural order as an order of grace and power, which means that already the union between time and eternity is begun. For there can be no real presence of the eternal in time without the Gospel promise coming true. Old things are passed away: behold they are become new. The Church's life ever stands at the dawning of a new day, and in the beams of the sun which illuminate its path and pilgrimage there is a moment of revelation which can never cease till it be taken up into the fulness of eternity.

J. K. Mozley.

THE TRAINING OF THE PEOPLE IN PRAYER*

How the parish priest can draw his people into the life of prayer, wake up their sense of God, and develop their latent spiritual capacities? That, of course, is your central task as shepherds of souls. You are required to build up Christian personalities; and there is no Christian personality where the life is not based on virtual or actual prayer. I am not one of those people who think that prayer can be taught: or that the many excellent textbooks on the subject can by themselves cause one single soul to pray. God only can reveal to the soul its capacity for communion with Him; and until He does so, whatever other people may tell it about prayer, it remains ignorant of what prayer is. But it is possible to prepare the ground, to convey by suggestion what cannot be conveyed in set terms, clear away obstacles, create a favourable atmosphere for the emergence of the spirit of prayer.

What, then, are the chief factors which you have at your disposal for this purpose? (1) There is your own life of prayer, your communion with God. (2) There is the parish church, and that which is done in it. (3) There is the formation of praying groups.

* The second of two lectures delivered at Oxford to the Worcester Clergy Convention, September, 1936. The first appeared in *Theology*, December, 1936.

First—yourself: your own devotional life. This is decisive. The primary way in which a priest can lead his people to pray is by doing it himself. The spirit of prayer is far more easily caught than taught. By a very large proportion of your flock, its nature will only be realized in so far as they see it in you, and discover that for you it is the very substance of life. "For their sakes I sanctify myself." That text has a very searching application to the priestly members of the Body of Christ. Cold, perfunctory, negligent prayer in the minister of religion is not only a personal fault and personal loss. It is a sin against his people; he fails his neighbour in a vital matter, as well as failing God. So the first step towards deepening the life of prayer in your parish is nearly always deepening it in yourself. It has to begin somewhere; and you cannot count on its beginning anywhere else. In the letters of that great teacher of souls, the Abbé de Tourville, there is a passage in which he describes how he faced up to the problem of teaching others, under conditions of great personal difficulty as to health and other limitations, to live the life of prayer; and how he realized that the essential point was that he himself must be, and go on being, his own first pupil. All those qualities of humble dependence on God, love, faithfulness, tranquillity of soul, which it demands could only be imparted if he possessed and fostered them in himself. I am sure that is the root of the matter. The old-fashioned phrase about "leading" others in prayer has a deep truth in it. The shepherd goes before, and the sheep follow after—some of them, anyhow. You do best, not when you turn to your people, teach and exhort them—though of course this has its place—but when you turn towards God, and go before them. It is always from what you do, not from what you say, that they will learn what prayer really is. The priest who prays often in his own church, for whom it is a spiritual home, a place where he meets God, is the only one who has any chance of breaking down our inveterate British shyness and persuading his people to pray in *their* own church.

Teach by the direct method. The mere presence of a pastor who does what he says, and more than he says—for whom prayer is the central reality of life—who comes early into his church to make his preparation before the Eucharist, is absorbed in that which he is going to do, does it with recollection and love, and returns to the church to make his thanksgiving among those to whom he has given the Bread of Life—this teaches prayer. So, too, the saying of Mattins and Evensong in your church is a most valuable help to the same end. Even though you do it alone, the fact that you do it counts. It is an act of devotion to God, done for your people; and if it entails a sacrifice of convenience or time, all the better. I have noticed that those who do not set much store by institutional religion always respect those whose religious practices cost them something, and who fulfil their religious obligations. Many who cannot or will not join you will yet be made to take the worship of God more seriously than before because you are seen to find time for it, and show it to be for you one of the ruling realities of your life. Izaak Walton, in his *Life of George Herbert*, describes how Mr. Herbert went twice every day to his church of Bemerton, rang the bell, and said his daily Office; and because all the common people loved him dearly, how even the ploughman would pause in his ploughing when "Mr. Herbert's saints' bell rang to prayers." That might still happen; and if it did, it would mean that twice a day the spirit of prayer was

radiating from the church, which is intended as its visible shrine and abiding place, to permeate the common life of the parish. To secure this if you can is surely a part of your vocation. It is true that only a minority will be affected, and at first perhaps no one will be affected. You must be prepared to endure much spiritual loneliness, and dispense with outward signs of success. But this must never discourage us. All the effective things in the history of the Church have been begun by individuals and done by small groups. The Holy Spirit, said Bishop Gore, always works through minorities. In your parish it is certain that the spiritually alert, those who are already disposed to prayer, will be in the minority; but it is of the first importance to get hold of them, ally yourself with them, make a nucleus and start there. That was our Lord's method; the little group of devoted souls as the instruments of wider evangelization.

Of course the fact that you conduct the services gives you an unparalleled opportunity to train your congregation in prayer. In those services, every aspect of the life of prayer is expressed: penitence and trust, adoration and thanksgiving, self-offering and confident demand, devotion to Christ and praise of the Eternal God. In so far as you give these great spiritual actions their full reality and worth, you are teaching by demonstration what worship is. The services of the Church are the real schools of prayer, when they are used rightly, and the congregation is helped, far more than is usually done, to understand the full significance of the various parts of Morning and Evening Prayer and the Eucharist. After the careful and disciplined development or your personal life towards God, I think the next step in teaching your people to pray, in so far as this is possible, will be the bit by bit interpretation of the services. Shewing them what the liturgy means and is, getting behind the beautiful Tudor English, and the symbolism which so often means nothing at all to those who use it, and revealing the great spiritual actions in which we take part when we join the Church's corporate worship: and further linking this spiritual action—of which the iturgy is the outward dress—with the actualities of daily life on the one hand, and the unchanging fact of God on the other hand. I know that there are lovely little books on these subjects in the tract case. But only a minority are going to buy and study the contents of the tract case: generally those who least need to do so, the people who are already interested in that kind of thing. Nor will reading have the same effect as oral teaching, given in the church where they worship, by the clergyman with whom they worship. There are many parishes where " down with the sermon and up with the instruction " would alone work a great renewal of the devotional life. The mere information, for instance, that the collect of the day is meant to collect and present before God all the secret prayers of the faithful, and should be accompanied by a silent act of prayer, is news to a surprising number of instructed Christians. So, too, plain addresses, with knowledge behind them, about what the Psalms and canticles mean and with what intention they are used by the Church, what spiritual riches are hidden in them, what dispositions and needs of the soul they imply, will be rewarded by the creation of an interested, intelligent, and really corporate parochial worship.

I hesitate to appeal to personal experience as regards the extent to which this is needed. But I will say this. A short time ago I gave a series of retreat addresses on the Lord's Prayer. They did not deal

in high or peculiar spiritual doctrine, but did try to bring out the real meaning and balance of the prayer; which is of course a complete direction for the life of communion with God. The result of these simple instructions was startling. Person after person—all educated Churchwomen—came to me saying that they had never before realized the meaning and scope of the prayer, and several frankly confessed that they had always found it boring. A set of addresses on the Communion Service had very much the same result. And these were not the average church-goer, but people sufficiently drawn to the life of prayer to come into retreat. I became convinced that only a minority of practising Anglicans now make the connection between the formulas of the Prayer Book and the deep realities of the life of prayer, which those formulas are intended to express, and indeed do express. This means that they only have a very sketchy idea of what it is that they are doing; and if they only have that, they won't be very deeply interested in doing it.

We go on to your second asset, the Parish Church; considered, not as a convenient place for Sunday worship but as a House of Prayer, a home of the spirit, a place set apart for the exclusive purpose of communion with God, and therefore an abiding witness to His reality, His attraction, His demand. There you have, in that building and all that it stands for, a great opportunity for making prayer a vivid fact in parochial life. It goes without saying that the church will be kept open; the open church is already a visible symbol of the loving welcome of God. But more than this, it must have a welcoming atmosphere; and possibly you and those who think with you will have to pray in it much, before that atmosphere is produced. But it can be produced. Nothing is more marked, to people of even a moderate degree of sensitiveness, than the difference between the bleak frowstiness of the convenient place of worship left empty all the week, and the homelike air of the church which its people—even a few people—frequent for prayer. No use putting the usual little notice in the porch about prayer and meditation, unless you make it one of your chief concerns to turn your church into a place where people desire to pray, and can pray. Such things, of course, as the homely and attractive Children's Corner, the chapel used for week-day services, kept fresh with flowers and furnished with devotional books, come in to help. But what helps most is the enclosing and friendly walls of a building wholly dedicated to intercourse with the Unseen; and the separation they effect from the sounds, demands, and complications of everyday life, the quiet and security from interruption. The church is there to give all this, and in giving it to provide a powerful stimulus to prayer. Of course people, and especially English people, need much support and encouragement if they are to form the habit of using their church for prayer; but all the efforts you make in this direction in sermons, teaching, private conversation, and example are more than worth while. Train your young people, especially confirmation candidates and Guild members, to regard this as the normal thing to do; many of them have no other chance of privacy, and it is useless to insist on the importance of prayer, or to speak to their elders of the strength and tranquillity which come from the habit of silent waiting on God, unless you provide suitable conditions. I know there are churches, in London and many towns, which are such homes of prayer; where people come in and out during the whole day, and especially after work in the evening, to dwell for a little while on the things of God and " escape from the weary round

of harassing thoughts into His eternal Presence." There might be such a living church in every parish, accepted as a matter of course and used as a matter of course, if its immense spiritual importance was realized; and those responsible for the religious life of the parish were determined to bring it into existence, whatever the apparent difficulties might be.

This brings us to the last of the three resources at your disposal for the fostering of the life of prayer among your people; the formation of the praying group. I do not mean by this a hot-housey association of pious ladies, whose extreme exhibition of fervour too often tends to put everyone else off. This should be avoided at all costs. But surely there is not any parish where it is impossible to find a few people, preferably quite simple and ordinary people, who care for their religion, and if asked to do a bit of real spiritual work for it, will respond. Those people are the starting-point for what I have in mind. They may be found among the more frequent communicants, among those already doing some kind of parish work, or quite often among the quiet, diffident, rather unnoticed members of the congregation. Ask them personally and individually—there will probably be only two or three to begin with—to undertake to meet in church once a week at a suitable time to pray together for half an hour; or perhaps less than that at the beginning. At first you will have to take a hand yourself, help, suggest, and perhaps instruct: and the fact that as the group gets going, you will naturally ask them to pray for particular things and persons, will always keep them in close touch with you. But the sooner these meetings pass into lay control, the better. As to what happens at them—there should be much freedom and variety. Some groups will generally prefer to pray together in silence; some will want leading, will like to use biddings, or particular forms and acts of prayer. All this is of secondary importance. The important thing is that week by week there should be in the church this homely, concerted act of worship and waiting upon God. The natural tendency of such groups to develop into a mere intercessory guild must be carefully guarded against. Worship, adoration, an increased sense of the reality and attractiveness of God, a deepening communion with Christ, these should be their first concern. Intercession is not the side on which most of our busy British prayers tend to fall short; but adoration and self-offering. Yet powerful and realistic intercessory action is always the work of those in whom the Godward temper of adoration and trust has first been established.

There are plenty of simple books of devotion, with suitable litanies, acts, and biddings, which the group can take when needed for guidance: and from time to time a led meditation, a simple picturing of a Gospel scene, and acts of prayer and communion with Christ developed from and within that scene—in fact, an elementary form of the Ignatian meditation and colloquy—will be found unrivalled in its power of drawing the groups more deeply into the spirit of prayer.

These groups need to be formed slowly and quietly through personal contacts. But once established, it is astonishing how quickly they become bound together, lose self-consciousness and shyness, begin to find new members and develop a corporate life of their own. If a group goes well, it will gradually become the nucleus of a network of prayer, spreading through the parish like leaven, deeply concerned with its life and problems, lifting up to God its anxieties, sorrows, and sins. Into

it can be drawn the invalids and old people, who cannot come to the church, but who can undertake to pray with the group at the agreed time in their own homes; and can be asked to remember its objects of prayer. In this way they are drawn into a living spiritual fellowship released from loneliness, and are given an entirely new sense of sharing in the life and work of their church. All suffering can be transformed into prayer, and so given a new meaning and dignity; and here is one of the simplest ways in which this great spiritual truth can be taught.

In large congregations it ought to be possible to set going two such groups. One will consist of young people, who must be encouraged to conduct it in their own way, and whose religious life will gain enormously in realism and interest by the responsibility and mutual support the group life entails. To it some at least of each year's confirmation candidates can be attached. The other group will consist of older men and women; of whom the first members will perhaps be found in the Mothers' Union and C.E.M.S. After a time these groups will develop their own procedure and technique. Their existence will very soon make itself felt in the quality of the Sunday worship, and in the changed atmosphere of the parish church; the intimidating bleakness, which too often meets and baffles us, being turned into homeliness, with the result that it will be more and more used for private prayer. The important thing is to preserve the note of free association, avoid the official tone, irksome rules, anything which stresses one particular type of churchmanship. Nor should membership be limited to regular communicants; the prayer group is rather a way of creating regular communicants. Even those who hardly go to church at other times should be welcomed if they wish to come. But the nucleus of the group must be faithful in their regularity of attendance and take their responsibility as to this very seriously.

I was present some time ago at the Sunday morning service of a country church where such a group had been established. When the service was over and the vicar had gone into the vestry, a woman in one of the pews started an act of thanksgiving, which was joined in by the rest. They sang a Psalm, recited some simple acts of devotion, and the leader said a prayer. It was all simple, homely, natural, orderly, and yet spontaneous: a real devotion of the people, setting their seal as it were on the worship which had been offered in their name. Where such a custom as this is set going, worship becomes a reality and the life of prayer will grow. Further, although intercession is never to be considered its first object, the praying group will become a powerful intercessory instrument. It will naturally tend to make its own the special interests of the parish, its problems and undertakings, and to hold up before God the sinful, the troubled, the sick. It is a humble bit of the praying Church, lifting up hands towards the supernatural world, waiting upon God; and therefore shares in all the duties and the graces of the praying Church. It should become and it can become the spearhead of the spiritual life of the parish, a powerful redeeming and evangelizing force, supporting the ministry and exercising an influence the more profound because it is secret. Within such groups individuals will gradually learn more and more of what prayer can be; and this combination of the corporate and the personal spiritual life, praying as members of the Church, aware of their social responsibility and yet also as in-

dividual souls most dear to God, is surely what we should aim at, if we want to make strong and sane Christians and not merely devotees.

Finally, though we have humbly to confess that all true prayer is caused by God and is a response to His incitement—and therefore that we are entirely unable of ourselves to teach others to pray or cause them to pray, except to some extent by suggestion and demonstration—still, it is clear that we can help their response, wake up their sense of spiritual reality, and stop various sources of error by teaching them in the right way about prayer. Now even on the simplest lines—*e.g.*, when instructing confirmation candidates—I am sure we ought to keep ever in the foreground the fact that prayer is not some separate devotional activity, but a part of the whole life; the bringing of all life, every bit of daily work and every human relationship, into harmony with God's Will, and glorifying Him in it. So it will include not only the praise of God, and petitions to God, but spiritual work done for and with God, as members of the church. This conception of prayer as something positive and dynamic—a Godward activity in which our whole being is involved, in which we do work—is surely more likely to arouse interest and enthusiasm, especially in young people, than any emphasis on its devotional side alone. It has something to say to the vigorous who want, and rightly want, a part to play in the creative action of their faith; and something also to say to the physically helpless, the sick and the old, who can yet make a great contribution to the Church's life of prayer, not only in the way of definite intercession, but by a giving of their whole will and love, their trials and sufferings, to His mysterious purposes, to be used as He wills for other souls. In Père Charles' beautiful *Prayer for all Times*, there is a passage in which he says to a soul which has been delivered from some sin or danger, or been brought from darkness to light: "How do you know whose prayer it is which has prevailed before God and won you this grace? Perhaps it was that old beggar at the church door, or the apple woman in the market, or some sleepless sufferer, or some little child, who made with simplicity an offering of their prayer; and it was accepted for the purposes of God." That seems to me the sort of doctrine which, put in a simple form, can and should enter into the teaching of prayer to the laity. It means that everything can be brought into the atmosphere of worship; offered to God, and so turned into prayer.

Thus we should teach Confirmation candidates that, in being received into full Church membership, and given full Church privileges, they also accept full Church responsibilities. This includes taking their part in the Church's great redeeming life of prayer; a duty to be performed regularly, not for themselves but as members of the Household of Faith, loyally taking their share in the household work, whatever their own feelings and preferences may happen to be. All real prayer can be brought under the three heads of adoration of God, communion with God, co-operation with God. I would always teach adoration, worship, first. Many, it is true, say that petition comes more naturally; but if we begin with self-interest, or even with our neighbours' or the world's interests, we may never get any further. "Lift up your hearts" is the formula for Christian prayer. It seeks first the Kingdom of God; and we ought to keep that truth in the foreground. We can show what adoration is by the direct method; by the use of the great adoring prayers of Christianity, such as the *Gloria* and the *Sanctus*, or simple acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, which are charged with the spirit of worship and love, and so

able to evoke that spirit in those who use them. That which we do in prayer has its subjective effect and importance; it speaks to God and speaks to our own souls too, and the acts of adoration and trust in which you make your people join will tend, far more effectually than any exhortation or description, to produce in them adoration and trust. No instruction on prayer should ever end without the practising together of the kind of prayer you have been trying to teach.

When it comes to intercession do let us be sure that this is made real to those who do it: avoiding in the first instance large, vague petitions and world-causes, and beginning with the most homely and immediate interests and needs. Unless and until people have learned to love their neighbours, fellow-workers, village or town, and hold these and their needs up to God, it is useless and unreal to encourage them to launch into the great intercessory efforts needed if they are really—not formally—to hold up to God in love the needs of the world. Further, I am sure we should insist more than we do on the close connection between prayer and sacrifice: and denounce that too common cadging type of prayer which asks for results to which those who pray are not prepared to make any real contribution. I feel very worried when I think, *e.g.*, of the prayers for peace or for reunion now offered in countless churches, and by numerous individuals who are not really prepared to do one difficult thing, or to make a single sacrifice either of possessions or of prejudices, in the interests of peace or of reunion. Peace is very costly; and reunion will be very costly. Both will need great renunciation; a great acceptance of the Cross. To tell people to pray for either is unreal, unless you also tell them that they must be prepared to take their share of effort and pay their share of the cost. And so with other more immediate interests—unemployment, industrial problems and so on—about which Church-people are encouraged to put up petitions, but often do not exert themselves much. Our teaching on prayer would gain immensely in reality and power, and be taken more seriously by many who now ignore it, did we insist on the close connection between prayer and our action outside prayer, and the unworthiness of mere cadging demands that God will do things which really lie within our own responsibility. Young people, who instinctively recoil from unreality and to whom the generous, the heroic, the creative make a strong appeal, can quickly be made to see this point, and learn to regard Christian action and Christian prayer as inseparable parts of one whole.

Finally there is the question of the personal instruction and advice on the interior life of prayer, its deeper aspects and problems, which you may of course at any time be asked to give to individuals; the guidance and support of a soul seeking closer communion with God. That, I suppose, is the most delicate and responsible work with which anyone can be entrusted, for here we are moving in regions where we often know ourselves to be insecure, and may be asked for help by those who are already far beyond us in spirituality. Here the only real safeguards are a great and confident submission to God as His servant, and great humility as regards ourselves and our own ideas. Moderation and lightness of touch, a consistent resistance of the temptation to press souls on, carefulness in not giving advanced books to those who are not yet ready for them, or in any other way trying to go faster than the Holy Spirit, are of the first importance. The growth of a soul in prayer is generally a very gradual process, and attempts to introduce it into

regions to which it is not yet called by God can do nothing but harm. It is always by the faithful and humble practice of the prayer now possible to it, and not by making spiritual experiments, that the soul is prepared for further advance.

There are two outstanding dangers attending the direction of souls. One is peculiar to our own times; the knowledge—seldom very deep—of the psychology of religion, which is now at the disposal of most people interested in the spiritual life. This often induces an unduly critical attitude towards the imaginative and emotional types of religious experience, which are, after all, common to humanity, and however close their connection with the purely natural levels of our life, can yet be the medium of communion with God. The imaginative type of devotion ought not to be condemned out of hand because we think we recognize its obvious psychological origins. Nor, on the other hand, ought it to be regarded as the sign of a special holiness. Like all else in the life of prayer, it must be judged by its fruits, and allowed to go on so long, and only so long, as it produces an increase of humility, courage, and love.

The other danger is worse. It is the inclination to discover a possible mystic in everyone who develops a passive or otherwise unusual type of prayer, or lays claim to visionary or other experiences. The general reading of mystical literature has produced a great crop of this kind of self-deception; often unwittingly encouraged by clergy who know themselves to be inexperienced in these matters, and are too humble-minded to deal with them by the obvious standards of common sense. We all know the type to whom his or her—I am afraid usually her—devotional life appears of paramount importance, and who is willing to talk about it at great length. The genuine contemplative is seldom found in this class. Those who are really moving towards deeper states of prayer will probably be those who make the least demands on you, and are not at all anxious to be understood: quiet and humble souls, who have not much to say about themselves. These you can help much by giving them encouragement and support in the periods of darkness and dryness which are certain to come upon them, and by guarding them against spiritual overstrain. In all this, of course, some first-hand knowledge of the great Christian writers on prayer—not the dilute account of their teaching now given in a multitude of little books—will help; and this is knowledge which, plainly, every priest ought to possess as a necessary part of his equipment. But your greatest help in this personal work with souls—in fact, your only real source of light and strength—will be your own life of communion with God. In Him all souls are interconnected; and it is in your own times of prayer that you will be mysteriously taught the needs and spiritual state of those you are called to help. So we end where we began. The work of the priest, for God and for souls, depends for its worth, and depends wholly, on his own life of prayer.

EVELYN UNDERHILL.

THE COLLEGE OF PREACHERS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I

One of the most interesting and significant institutions to be found anywhere in the Anglican communion, the College of Preachers in Washington, the capital city of the United States, has been celebrating the tenth anniversary of the beginning of its work. While there are a considerable number of persons in England, clerical and lay, who know something of its unique task, and some who have from time to time contributed to it their advice and personal assistance, most British Churchmen have probably never heard of it or, if they have, have misunderstood its purpose. It is not, as might be supposed, a "theological college" for training ordinands, nor a confraternity of skilled preachers who go up and down America on special missions of instruction and exhortation. It is, rather, an institution designed and administered for the post-ordination training of the clergy, aiming especially at the improvement of their preaching.

The late Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Woods, who was present when, in 1929, the truly magnificent new building of the College was dedicated, opened the first conference held therein with these words: "There are two classes of preachers. The smaller consists of those who have something to say; the larger of those who have to say something." The College has endeavoured ever to lay its emphasis on helping to promote preachers into the former class, on improving the *content* of preaching rather than the manner of delivery of sermons. That also receives a proper attention; but the chief endeavour is to help the clergy to know better the Faith, ways toward holiness, contemporary thought, world movements in politics and economics—not for their own sakes, but rather that those who think thereon may the more powerfully preach the good news of Jesus the King.

The work is done through two agencies—the conferences and the library.

Conferences are held throughout the year, except in the summer, when Washington is for some weeks excessively hot. Each lasts from five to eight days, and numbers one or two who are skilled specialists in some sort or other of preaching, and, usually, twenty student priests. The latter ordinarily are men ordained not less than three years nor more than ten, picked because they have shewn to their Bishops or to other

observers rather more than usual promise of becoming better pastors and preachers. In no conference does any geographical section have predominance, nor any school of thought in theology. One object steadily held in mind is to draw together men from distant districts—and they are indeed distant in America—and men of High, Low, Broad, Catholic, Evangelical, Modernist, and Post-modernist ways of looking on the Church and Christianity, that they may dwell together for a while in constructive amity. The unifying of the Church is one object of the College. The priests who attend the conferences all feel this. They often come prepared for controversy, and sometimes even to despise others; but they leave with an Evangelism enriched from parties other than their own.

The College pays the travelling expenses of the conferees, which is necessary since the more able preachers are, as in England, not always the better paid, and because distances and railway fares are enormous. Frequently a priest must come from 1,000 miles, and sometimes from as far as 2,500 miles, for a conference, at three-halfpence a mile, in addition to the cost of sleeping-berth and food.

During the first ten years, 2,123 priests attended these conferences, some of them several times. When one recalls that there are only 6,392 priests in the Episcopal Church in America, it will be seen that one-third of the whole number has been brought under the influence of the College, its Warden, its varied leaders, its atmosphere of urgency in preaching, its depth of devotion, and its breadth of vision.

The leaders have included some of the most distinguished preachers both from America and from the British Isles. Among the visitors from this side the water have been the late Bishop of Winchester, the Bishop of St. Albans, Bishop Embling of Rhodesia, the Rev. Gilbert Shaw, Canon Dewar of York, the Rev. Father Peck, Canon Barkway of St. Albans, Dean Selwyn of Winchester, the Rev. Father Humphry Beevor, Canon Lilley of Hereford, Canon Hodgson of Winchester, and Professor Cock of Southampton. Among the American scholars who have led conferences have been: Presiding Bishop Perry, Bishop Dallas of New Hampshire, Bishop Stewart of Chicago, Bishop Johnson of Colorado, Bishop Fiske of Utica, Bishop Burleson of South Dakota, Professor Urban of Yale, Dr. Paul Elmer More of Princeton, Professors Montgomery and Yerkes of Philadelphia, Dean Fosbroke and Dr. Frank Gavin of the General Seminary, Professor John Oliver of Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Howard Robbins, Dr. Iddings Bell, Dr. Joseph Fort Newton, Dr. Frederick Fleming, Father Hughson, O.H.C., Dr. Z. B. T. Phillips and Canon Winfred Douglas.

The variety of topics studied is made clear by a glance at the conference subjects, which have been included: Preaching and Worship, Preaching and World Peace, Preaching and the Social Order, Preaching the Prophets, Preaching the New Testament, Expository Preaching, Rural Preaching, Preaching and Modern Thought, the Preacher and Pastoral Psychology, Preaching Missions, Preaching the Uniqueness of Christianity, Preaching Material, the Preacher as a Citizen, etc.

Quite as interesting, however, and probably even more influential on the improvement of preaching in the American Church, is the work of the library of the College, which is under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Edwin B. Niver. Each conference leader is asked to make a list of what he deems the twenty best books on his subject. These are purchased and circulated free, one each month, to each conference-member after return home. That provides a book a month for nearly two years, to be read and reported on. At the end of that time, the member has the privilege of borrowing any book he desires from the general list, which now numbers 1,702 volumes, every one of which has been purchased on expert advice. There is not, certainly in America, a more wisely chosen theological library available for free consultation and borrowing. This has proved a Godsend to the clergy who have been at the College, especially to the many who are in isolated places, where no good books are available. That the library is used is plain from the fact that, in 1935, 5,001 volumes were sent out to clerical borrowers.

II

The College was conceived many years ago, in the mind of the late Dr. Satterlee, Bishop of Washington, while he was taking the first steps toward creating on the hills behind the capital city (which now surrounds the site) a cathedral which should serve not merely his diocese but the entire nation. One of its major uses, as he said, was to be a centre of evangelism, "a watch-tower, from which signs of the times are detected," "a home of religious learning," "a school of the prophets," "where skilled theologians and interpreters of the Queen of Sciences shall be competent to translate the doctrinal truths of theology into the common language of life, in such a way as to take hold of the living convictions of thinking men."

The carrying out of this hope had to wait for a quarter of a century, during which time the cathedral itself became at least partly realized in structure. The "school of prophets" might, perhaps, have been forgotten, had it not remained

implanted as an idea firmly in the minds of two other men, also Bishops. When Dr. Freeman was elected Bishop of Washington, it was with a reputation already established as the most eloquent preacher in the American Church. Almost at the same time, the then Bishop of Pennsylvania, Dr. Rhinelander, was forced to resign his See on account of frail health. He had been Bishop Satterlee's chaplain thirty years before. Throughout his ministry, which had included eight years of teaching in theological colleges, he had realized increasingly the need of post-ordination training for the clergy and had hoped that some practical steps might be taken to this end. In the summer of 1925, preliminary advice was taken from a number of interested Bishops and priests, the consent of the chapter was secured, Bishop Rhinelander was made a canon of the cathedral and Warden of the College; and in 1926, with no headquarters, with little money, with no library, without any facilities, but with faith and a sense of urgency, the conferences were inaugurated. For the years 1925-29, the College was at work under these limitations. Good work was done—so good that the rightness of the plan was apparent; but it was temporary in character and hampered in scope. Then God sent, quite unexpectedly, the necessary money.

Bishop Freeman tells the story of the gift which made possible the greater labours of the College—the largest single sum ever given at one time to any single enterprise of the American Church. In May, 1927, the Bishop was requested to come, as soon as he could, to Paris. His old friend, Alexander Smith Cochran, a carpet manufacturer of Yonkers, New York, wished to see him. Mr. Cochran was more than a man of wealth; he had a powerful intelligence and an excellent taste; he was a conscientious employer and an honourable citizen; but he never had shewn more than a casual interest in religion. When Dr. Freeman arrived in France, however, he found a man on fire for God. Mr. Cochran explained that he had had in his boyhood some " public school religion," which had meant nothing. Illness had wracked him of late. Death lay before him. Why had religion meant so little all these years ? Why did parsons so misunderstand the needs of laymen like himself ? Why had preaching left him untouched ? It was not all his own fault. There should be better preaching. He had heard of the College of Preachers. What was it for ? What was it like ? The Bishop explained. The interview lasted far into the night. Then, quite unexpectedly, Mr. Cochran said: " I will give you the money to make that work permanent and efficient." The gift, when it came, amounted to £290,000. Approximately £200,000 was set apart for endowment, and

with the £90,000 remaining there was erected, in the Cathedral close, a stone's throw from the north transept, one of the most quietly impressive collegiate buildings in America. Radiating from a central tower a series of wings, one above the other, ascends the hillside. The building contains a Warden's apartments, accommodation for the small additional permanent staff—a chaplain and a librarian; lodgings for twenty-five conferees; refectory and common rooms and library, large enough for a conference of one hundred; and the Chapel of St. Augustine of Hippo. It is hard to imagine a small college more gracefully and competently equipped. And it is a comfort to know that all this physical structure is implemented by an endowment which yields some £9,000 a year. Before the buildings were completed, two years after the gift, Alexander Cochran was dead.

Of the future of the College, one may say little, except that its resources make it fairly certain to function with vigour. The property belongs to the Chapter, not to the College officials. This would seem to insure it against the dry-rot of academic inbreeding. Much depends upon the personality of whoever may be the Bishop of Washington, for a Bishop bulks larger in an American Cathedral than in an English one; and much depends upon the Warden, who must soon be found to succeed Dr. Rhinelander. The latter is a man courageous, simple, and so afire with love of them for whom Christ died that he draws men to himself and then to the feet of God.

Bernard Iddings Bell.

THE THEOLOGICAL TEACHING OF F. D. MAURICE

Much has been written during the last few years concerning the Oxford Movement and Oxford theology during the nineteenth century. It is not always remembered that in the same century there was also if not a Cambridge Movement, a Cambridge theology perfectly distinct and characteristic, as Martineau pointed out,* " formed by Cambridge men and with the impress of Cambridge studies upon it." S. T. Coleridge taught and prophesied at Highgate, but he had been an Exhibitioner of Jesus College. Julius Charles Hare was a Fellow of Trinity before delivering his Charges as Archdeacon of Lewes; F. D. Maurice was an undergraduate at both Oxford and Cambridge, but it was the years at Cambridge and his friendship there with Hare and Sterling which had decisive and shaping influence upon his thought, and it was to Cambridge that he returned in 1866 as Professor of Casuistry and Moral Theology. The ruling ideas of Coleridge, Hare and Maurice were interpreted to a later generation at Cambridge by Westcott and Hort. Maurice's most famous work, *The Kingdom of Christ*, was begun in 1836 (just a hundred years ago) as *Letters to a Quaker*. Westcott died in 1901. It will be seen, therefore, that this Cambridge school of thought had a long and continuous influence throughout the century.

Of these great Cambridge teachers and prophets F. D. Maurice is the most outstanding as his influence is the most profound. Although he was underestimated, disparaged or misunderstood by the great majority of his contemporaries, including J. A. Froude, Carlyle, Ruskin, Matthew Arnold, Disraeli, Gladstone, Pusey and Mansel, in our day he is coming into his own. There is a growing unanimity in seeing him as "incomparably the greatest Churchman of the nineteenth century alike in vision, in life, and in achievement."† The Dean of Exeter has written of him as " the father of modern English theology " and as " one of the six great formative minds of the nineteenth century."‡ Father Hebert acclaims him as " that seer and prophet of the future whose importance has never yet been fully recognized " and whose teaching " will form the basis of the constructive theology of the future."§ Dr. C. C. J. Webb has

* Martineau: *Essays and Addresses and Reviews*, vol. i., p. 224.
† C. E. Raven in *Christian Socialism*.
‡ S. C. Carpenter: *Church and People*, pp. 174 and 532.
§ A. G. Hebert: *Liturgy and Society*, p. 108 *f*.

drawn attention to his importance: "Maurice was one of the most influential figures in the religious world of his generation, . . . owing largely to a certain lack of literary genius his writings have not been found attractive to a later generation, and there is a danger that his importance in his own day compared with men of greater gifts of expression may be underrated."* Father Herbert Kelly, whose profound and inspiring teaching has been a revelation to many, has made generous acknowledgment of a great debt to Maurice: "I learned almost everything first from Maurice. Then I learned it over again."†

The bewildering diversity of judgments upon Maurice in his own day (noted by Raven and by Masterman)‡ and the underrating of his importance is largely explained, as Dr. Webb mentions, by the difficulties of his style. Dr. Martineau alone among his contemporaries, while admitting that Maurice's fault was "to delay his meaning too long by his scrupulous candour of concession," defended his style, "for consistency and completeness of thought and for precision it would be difficult to find his equal."§ Disraeli, on the other hand, voiced the prevailing opinion when he spoke of Maurice as "the nebulous professor who seems in his style to have revived chaos, and who if he could succeed in obtaining a perpetual study of his writings would go far to realize that eternal punishment to which he objects."‖ Unquestionably Maurice's style wants distinction. While it can rise occasionally to heights of power and eloquence, more often it is cloudy, winding, obscure. In his Introduction to the Warburton Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Maurice gives long extracts fron Newman's Essay on Development and a scathing commentary upon them. The contrast in style between the grace, the clarity, the conciseness of the quotations, and the diffuse rhetoric of the criticism is a painful one for admirers of Maurice. It is at times like a cloud trying to explain a crystal! Maurice wrote too much and too quickly, for in addition to his manifold activities on behalf of the Christian Socialist Movement, the education of the working classes and the higher education of women, he wrote over forty volumes, and the subject-matter of them embraces ancient and modern philosophy, Church history, English literature, education, biblical exegesis, social and political questions of the day. F. J. A. Hort's characterization of these books as "collections of hints" is very apt. A careful reading of them shows that

* C. C. J. Webb: *Religious Thought since* 1850, p. 56.
† H. H. Kelly: *The Gospel of God*, VI.
‡ *Cf.* C. F. G. Masterman: *F. D. Maurice.*
§ *Op. cit.*, p. 264.
‖ Buckle: *Life*, vol. iv., p. 372.

there is hardly any aspect of the Christian faith and life which he does not consider in a profound and illuminating way.

In biographical studies of Maurice and in Church histories of the period his teaching is generally described by reference to three great controversies in which he took a leading part, concerning Eternal Life, Christian Socialism and the meaning of Revelation. As one who held views of eternal life considered by his age to be heretical, as the leader of the Christian Socialists, and as the protagonist of Mansel in a long forgotten and unpleasantly bitter controversy, that is how Maurice is commonly remembered. It would seem that in these controversies Maurice's position has been so far accepted as the true one that there is little to learn from him now. We do not need, it might be thought, to con the forty volumes of Maurice to be convinced that in so far as a social system is based upon fear and acquisitiveness it is a denial of the Divine Order revealed in Christ, that belief in the everlasting torment of the wicked in hell is no vital part of the Christian Faith, or that Revelation is not the announcement of statements about God but the unveiling of God's mind and life in the Incarnation. Therefore, as his style is obscure, and has none of the haunting beauty and power of a Newman or a Robertson, there is no reason why we should read him. This is a profound mistake. No one can study the controversies in which Maurice was engaged without being impressed by the "bewilderingly rich instructiveness" of his contributions to them. As, however, much has been written about these subjects (Dr. Raven and C. F. G. Masterman have done full justice to his Christian Socialism; R. H. Hutton's *Essays* expound clearly the controversy with Mansel; Archdeacon Storr* and Dr. S. C. Carpenter† have given excellent accounts of his teaching concerning Eternal Life and the meaning of Revelation), other aspects of his teaching might be considered in order to vindicate the high claims which have been made for him. Out of writings which cover the whole field of Christian philosophy, theology and ethics it is difficult to know which themes to select as being most interesting, characteristic and relevant to the needs of today. Perhaps his teaching on,

(1) the Incarnation,
(2) the Person and Significance of Jesus,
(3) Prayer,

will serve to illustrate some of his most cherished convictions.

* *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century. Cf.* too *Movements of Religious Thought,* by John Tulloch (1885).

† *Church and People,* especially pp. 315-29 and 526-34.

THE INCARNATION

"If we desire to have our thoughts orderly," Maurice once declared,* "not loose and incoherent, not mere qualifications and contradictions one of another, there must be a centre round which they revolve." Yet a modern literary critic writes of Maurice: "He seems hardly to have had a mental centre."† This is a seriously mistaken judgment. The centre of his mind and teaching, "the master light of all his seeing," was the Incarnation. It was his grasp of the truth of the Incarnation which led him to a painful family severance, brought him into the ministry of the Church, inspired his social teaching, explained his denials of the popular ideas of life after death and which compelled him to enter into the controversy with Mansel. He had learned from his Unitarian father, and from the communion in which he was brought up, to look for revelations of God wherever He was to be found—in the glories and beauties of the created world, in conscience, in human life and love, in the philosophers of Greece and in the prophets of Israel. He welcomed and rejoiced in all these revelations and never fell into what Von Hügel used to condemn as "excessive Christo-centricism." But he saw that the Incarnation was the constitutive belief of the Christian Faith and the cardinal event in the history of mankind. In the Incarnation, he realized, God has laid bare His heart, He has come to us and sought us, He has done something which makes possible the response of love and trust from men. All non-Christian religions, he insisted ("human religions," as Erskine of Linlathen, one of Maurice's teachers, called them), are religions of human aspiration, Christianity is the religion of Divine relevation. The Christian Faith is not founded on the principle that we must do something, feel something or believe something in order to win God's love and forgiveness, but on the principle that God has first of all loved, forgiven and sought us. "The highest of all, the Creator of heaven and earth, does not dwell in solitary, selfish happiness. He seeks the confidence of His creatures . . . He feels their distrust and alienation. . . . As He has given them wills, He seeks to bring them into harmony with His own."‡ Christian faith is in "an absolute living God actually ruling in the world, seeking men not first sought by them. . . ." "All Brahminical acts, services, sacraments imply an effort or scheme on the part of the creature to raise himself to God. All Christian acts,

* F. D. Maurice: *Theological Essays*, p. 194.
† Elton: *Survey of English Literature*, 1830-80, vol. i., p. 211.
‡ F. D. Maurice: *The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 200.

services, sacraments imply that God has sought for the creature that He might raise him to Himself."*

In the Incarnation we have not "the picture of a lazy benevolence, looking down from a serene region of enjoyment upon a world of misery and wishing it well. We have the history of a Divine descent into that misery to wrestle with it, to bring back the victims of it into the home of peace from which they had wandered."†

The Incarnation not only reveals to us the truth that God does not wait to be sought but Himself seeks man, it shows us too the depth and the fulness of the Divine Love. "It is certain that if we receive the Incarnation of Christ as a revelation of God's mind and character to men, any language which has been used to denote the fulness and universality of the Divine Love and Compassion, instead of being exaggerated, instead of requiring to be modified and qualified, must be tame and cold. . . ."‡ Through the Incarnation we understand that "the idea of the love of God is an absolute primary idea which cannot be reduced under any other; which cannot be explained away by any other; which no record, experiences, or dogmas, if they have lasted for a thousand generations, can weaken or contradict; which must be the foundation of all thought, all theology, all human life. . . ."§

"The love of God the foundation of all thought, all theology, all human life"—long before the days of Barth and Brunner Maurice insisted on the priority and initiative of God. What these contemporary German and Swiss theologians are doing for continental Protestantism the revived interest in Maurice's teaching may do in England. "The increased willingness of modern Christians," declares the Dean of Exeter, "to recognize that it is not what we do but what God is doing that matters, I trace in a large measure to the influence of Maurice."‖ Maurice condemned Mansel's rationalism because it reduced Revelation to a series of propositions received by the mind and exalted these propositions into the place of God. He was equally unsparing in his criticism of the Evangelicals and Methodists of his day for "setting up their inward feelings and experiences in the place of Christ and His sacrifice." Mansel and the Evangelicals seem to be a long way apart. Maurice had the insight to recognize that in one vitally important way they are alike, they both regarded the place where Revelation is given as

* F. D. Maurice: *Religions of the World*, pp. 165 and 183.
† F. D. Maurice: *The Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven*, p. 158.
‡ F. D. Maurice: *Lincoln's Inn Sermons*, vol. iii., p. 73.
§ F. D. Maurice: *The Kingdom of Christ*, vol. i., p. 135.
‖ *Op. cit.*, p. 532.

in the human heart and mind, so that what is really important is either the idea which is formulated in the mind or the emotion awakened in the heart. In truth, the really important and primary thing is neither of these, but the self-revealing acts of God which awaken response in both heart and mind. In two or three pregnant sentences of his recent Lectures to the College of Preachers,* Archbishop Temple gives a wonderfully lucid explanation of the real issue between Maurice on the one hand, and Mansel and the Evangelicals on the other (without, of course, mentioning these old nineteenth-century controversies). The "locus of revelation," Dr. Temple points out, is not in the human mind either as "dictated truth" (*i.e.*, Mansel and his regulative ideas) or as "imaginative apprehension" (the poetic glow and feelings of the Evangelicals). "I want to suggest to you that on the Biblical view the locus, the sphere, the area of revelation is primarily the historic event, not thought in men's minds at all, but the thing that happens." Doubtless, God's self-revealing acts need the deep feeling of the mystic, the insight of the prophet, the thought of the scholar to interpret and declare them, but it is the acts themselves that are primary. The foundation of Christian theology, we are learning from Maurice, is not the ideals, the sins, the feelings, the sentiments of man, but the loving Will of God.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS

Von Hügel once complained of a Christian philosopher that he was not sufficiently Synoptic. Similar criticisms were made of Maurice. He was even accused of minimizing the historical character of Christ, of treating Him as an impersonal spiritual influence.† While it is true that Maurice was thoroughly Johannine in spirit and outlook but lacking "the realism which St. John miraculously has,"‡ to accuse him of indifference to or lack of interest in the Synoptic portrayal of Jesus is manifestly unjust. He had learned well from his master, Coleridge, that "the true life of Christians is to eye Christ in every step of His life, not only as their rule but as their strength."§ He sought always in his teaching "to bring the facts of our Lord's life into exceeding prominence."‖ His Discourses on St. Luke's Gospel and on "The Unity of the New Testament" contain many penetrating, tender and eloquent expositions of the parables, of the sayings and doings of Jesus. Yet though he was always

* W. Temple: *The Preacher's Theme Today*, pp. 19, 20, 21.
† *Cf.* J. H. Rigg: *Modern Anglican Theology* (1859).
‡ S. C. Carpenter, *op. cit.*, p. 533.
§ S. T. Coleridge: *Aids to Reflection*, p. 204 (Bohn's edition).
‖ F. D. Maurice: *Letter on Mr. Ward and the New Statute.*

concerned " to be present as if in body at every recorded act of the Redeemer's life," he desired to know Him not after the flesh but after the spirit. He tried to set forth to the mind of his generation the true conception of Christ in relation (1) to the Father whom He revealed; (2) to the human family He came to redeem.

(1) Against theories of the Atonement and philosophies of Revelation which seemed, in effect, to set the Father against the Son—fearing the Father as Wrath and worshipping the Son as Love—Maurice insisted that Jesus is the perfect Revelation of the Mind and Heart of God the Father. " He that hath me, hath seen the Father," that is the most significant fact about His life. Jesus does nothing except what He sees the Father doing. The whole of God's perfectly loving Will shone forth in the words, deeds and sufferings of the Son.* He lived in the obscurity of Nazareth, He was baptized by John, He suffered temptation, He healed diseases and preached the Kingdom, He gave Himself to the Cross—all in obedience to the Father's Will. In the Cross and Passion Jesus is " not wringing a hard consent from a reluctant Judge to pardon rebels."† He is not " bearing death in obedience to an inevitable fate,"‡ He is yielding Himself to and expressing His Father's Love. Because of this absolute oneness of the Father and the Son the sacrifice of the Cross—unlike sacrifice in non-Christian religions—is not a sacrifice " that rises from man to God but one that comes down from God upon man."§ It is not a sacrifice which awakens or constrains the Father's love, but which reveals that love in such a way as to win the response of love and trust from us. The love of Christ is not separate from the love of the Father, or more worthy of trust and worship, it is " the perfect image and reflex of the love which is the nature and essence of God."‖

(2) What distressed Maurice about the " Lives " of Jesus by Renan and Strauss was not so much the rationalizing attempt to purge the Gospels of the supernatural, but the readiness to portray Jesus as a mere human teacher, as a prophet, a hero, a man who was successful in the sphere of religion. The life of Jesus, he saw clearly, could not be truly understood, and certainly was not the good news unless it was realized that the Christ revealed in the Gospels is One who is the living Centre of the Universe, the Good Shepherd, the True Vine, the Head and the Light of every man born into the world. " We cannot

* *Cf.* F. D. Maurice: *Patriarchs and Lawgivers*, p. 185 *f.*
† F. D. Maurice: *Lincoln's Inn Sermons*, vol. i., p. 301.
‡ F. D. Maurice: *The Doctrine of Sacrifice*, p. 242 *f.*
§ *Ibid.* p. 280 *f.*
‖ *Ibid.*, p. 287; *cf. The Religions of the World*, p. 182.

read the Gospels simply and directly except we consider them the revelation of Him upon earth who is the light that lighteneth us and all men, whether they walk in His light or dwell in darkness." " The principle which underlies all St. Paul's teaching is that the relation of Christ to man is that which explains all the facts of the Gospel: that when He took flesh and dwelt among us He declared Himself to be that King, that Son of God, that Corner Stone of Humanity of which all nations had been dreaming."* " Until Christ be presented to men as related to themselves, to everyone, and not merely as a character in a book, we shall see more and more noble spirits sinking into distrust and despair."†

The teaching of Maurice concerning Christ and our union with Him was severely criticized by the Evangelicals of the day, who even accused him of reviving Neoplatonism.‡ They asserted that his message to the sinner was not (as it should be): " be converted into something which at present you are not " (that is, from a child of wrath into a child of grace), but " awaken to the fact of what you already are." Maurice never in any way minimized the fact of sin or the need for repentance, but he believed that deeper than sin, and the separation caused by sin, is this union with Christ and His presence in us. However great our sins, however calamitous their consequences, at the heart of the concentrically manifold self is not evil but " the true sinless root of humanity " which is Christ. " Men found," Maurice wrote, "that the further they went down into themselves the more there was of corruption and darkness and evil, until at last they supposed that the very root of their being was nothing else. St. Paul had gone into these depths, he had found this rottenness in himself. But he discovered that there was a root below himself, a true Divine root for himself, for every man. He found that each man, when he tries to contemplate himself apart from Christ, is that evil creature in which no good thing dwells. But no man has a right to contemplate himself apart from Christ; God does not so contemplate him. He was formed at first in the Divine Word. To be ignorant of Him, the true root of his life, is his misery, to know Him is life and peace."§

PRAYER

Anyone who seeks in Maurice's sermons and addresses for expositions of any of the classical methods of prayer (Ignatian,

* *Life of F. D. Maurice*, edited Frederick Maurice, vol. i., p. 510; and F. D. Maurice: *Lincoln's Inn Sermons*, vol. v., p. 31.

† *Ibid.*, i., p. 452.

‡ *Cf.* Rigg, *op. cit.*, p. 130 *f.*

§ F. D. Maurice: *Lincoln's Inn Sermons*, vol. i., p. 98.

Dominican, etc.) or for detailed consideration of the feelings and interior experiences of the one who prays will be disappointed. He will find nothing at all concerning the purgative, unitive, illuminative way, the Dark Night of the Soul, discoursive and affective prayer and the like. Charts and plans of the Vita Contemplativa Maurice regarded as burdensome and tormenting. Inheriting from his mother a tendency to introspection, and having seen in her the unhappiness caused by scrupulous questioning, morbid self-concern and the tyranny of feelings, he recoiled with horror from all preoccupation with states of feeling, whether Methodist, Baptist or Catholic. In his teaching on prayer he concentrated on a few basic truths, believing that if these truths were allowed to sink far into the soul prayer would become living, fruitful, real.

The first of two truths which he emphasized frequently is this—Christian prayer is grounded upon the Incarnation. Just as he distinguished two kinds of religion—religion based on human aspiration and religion based on Divine Revelation—so he recognized two corresponding methods of prayer, Christian prayer and what for want of a better name he called " heathen prayer."* Examples of heathen prayer, he did not hesitate to point out, might be found not only in India or Africa but amongst religious people in England. What are the characteristics of these two conceptions of prayer, and how are they distinguished ?

" Heathen " prayer is based upon the desires and aspirations of men. It is the attempt on the part of man to climb up to God, to elevate himself to God, to win a reward from God. It assumes that we know what our needs are, but that we are less sure of the character of God. We must pray, therefore, with such iteration that the unknown God will be constrained in the end to hear and answer. " They think that they shall be heard for their much speaking." The strength of " heathen " prayer lies in this much speaking, for the less sure we are of God the more will depend upon our efforts. " A number of arrows must be shot at different distant marks that there may be a chance of some hitting."†

Christian prayer differs in every way from this " heathen " prayer. It is not based upon the ascending movement of man, but upon the descending movement of God. Everything begins with God, with the longing for Him which He breathes into the heart, and with the manifestation of Himself in the Incarnation through which that desire is satisfied. The Incarnation gives us

* *Cf.* F. D. Maurice: *The Prayer Book and the Lord's Prayer*, p. 149 *f.*
† *Ibid.*, p. 150.

that knowledge of God which makes prayer real, the knowledge of God, that is, as watching over, drawing to Himself, loving, listening to the prayers of all men and of each individual man. In praying we are sure of the character and mind of God, but we are not sure that we know what our needs are, or what is the wisest fulfilment of them. God, we believe, knows what these needs are, it is He who makes us conscious of them and gives to us all the earnestness that we can ever have in making them known.*

The practice of prayer, which is based on the revelation of God in Christ—*i.e.*, Christian prayer—follows the method of the Collects. These prayers do not begin with some chance feeling of ours, or with attempts to work up feelings, but with the Name of God, " with a strong satisfying view of the character of God."† " Almighty God, who hast given us thine only begotten Son . . ." " who dost teach the hearts of thy faithful people . . ." " who art always more ready to hear than we are to pray, and are wont to give more than either we desire or deserve. . . ." From the Collects we see that the best way of beginning our prayers is to set before us the mind of God more clearly than any of the occasions or desires which lead us to seek Him. In this way we shall be saved from the " continuous circumstantial prayers " and from the " over excited, overstrained language " which shew unreality of mind and a desire to lash ourselves into feeling.

Another truth to which Maurice constantly refers is that Christian prayer is essentially the prayer of a family.‡ The Lord's Prayer teaches us to say not " My Father, give me . . ." but " Our Father, give us. . . ." In the highest exercise of our lives, the Prayer reminds us, we are associated with one another. Praying as one of a family we ask nothing for ourselves that we do not ask for others. This means not only that we are to pray and worship together in one place as a family, but that when we pray alone we are still to pray not as solitary isolated individuals but as members of a family. Whenever we seek to enter into the Mind and Life of God we are to take our brothers and sisters with us, for solitude in prayer is a kind of selfishness. Christian prayer is not the flight of the alone to the Alone, but the intercourse of the family of God through the Son with their Father in heaven.‖

* * * * *

Alfred Marshall, later to become famous as the author of

* *Cf.* F. D. Maurice: *Christmas Day and Other Sermons*, p. 108 *f.*
† F. D. Maurice: *The Prayer Book and the Lord's Prayer*, pp. 157-8.
‡ *Cf.* F. D. Maurice: *The Kingdom of Christ*, vol. ii., p. 26 *f.* (Everyman edition).
‖ *Cf.* F. D. Maurice: *The Gospel according to St. John*, p. 418.

Principles of Economics, was an undergraduate when Maurice returned to Cambridge as Professor. He has given us in a letter a memorable description of one of the meetings of the Grote Society, at which Henry Sidgwick devoted himself " to drawing out Maurice's recollections of English social and political life in the thirties, forties and fifties. Maurice's face shone out bright with its singular holy radiance, as he responded to Sigwick's enquiries and suggestions; and as we others afterwards said, that we owed all the delight of that evening to him. No one else among us knew how to keep on again and again arousing the warm latent energy of the old man, for he always looked tired and would relapse into silence after two or three minutes' talk, however eager it had been, unless stimulated by someone who knew how to strike the right chord."* Similarly, just as the profound knowledge of Maurice was drawn out for the benefit of this meeting by Sidgwick's eager and pertinent questioning, so in order to profit from Maurice's writings—which are as copious as his conversation on that occasion was sparing—co-operation is required from the reader. He must be able to ask the right questions. He must give much independent thought and study to Maurice's answers. Anyone who reads in this way will be amazed at the depth, richness and subtlety of thought offered to him on every article of the Creed, and on all aspects of the Christian Faith and Life, on the Sacraments, the Church and the Ministry, the Kingdom of God, the meaning of Faith, the Forgiveness of Sins, the Holy Spirit, the Atonement. We have only considered in this paper a few of the more interesting and fundamental of his contributions to Christian thought, but enough, it is hoped, to win agreement with the judgment of Hort that " every day brings out more clearly the truth, beauty, wisdom, scripturality and unity of Maurice's teaching."†

H. Hodkin.

* The letter is given in *A Memoir of Henry Sidgwick*, p. 138.
† *Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, vol. i., p. 67.

MISCELLANEA

NEW LIGHT ON A PASSAGE IN THE PASTORALS

(*2 Timothy* ii. 25-26.)—*μήποτε δώῃ αὐτοις ὁ θεὸς μετανοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας, καὶ ἀ ν α ν ή ψ ω σ ι ν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος, ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.*

This is one of the most vexed passages in the New Testament, and yet a slight alteration in one word, *ἀνανήψωσιν*, makes it quite simple. The Authorized Version renders: "If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will" (with marginal notes, "awake" and "taken alive"). The Revised Version reads: "If peradventure God may give them repentance unto the knowledge of the truth, and they may recover themselves (margin, 'return to soberness') out of the snare of the devil, having been taken captive (margin, 'taken alive') by the Lord's servant unto the will of God."

This is a very involved rendering. It follows Wetstein, and Bengel, who took *ὑπ' α ὐ τ ο ῦ* as referring back to *δ ο ῦ λ ο ν δέ Κυρίου* ("the *servant of the Lord* must not fight"), which occurs five lines before, is separated by many clauses, while the main thought is changed. It separates *ἐζωγρημένοι* from *παγίδος* with which it is logically connected, endeavouring to bring in here a reference to Luke v. 10, "thou shalt catch men," *ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν*—a very far-fetched and unnatural connection. The Authorized Version follows the Vulgate, "et resipiscant a diaboli laqueis, a quo tenentur at ipsius voluntatem." Both make *αὐτοῦ* and *ἐκείνου* refer to the same subject—the devil. But this is absurd.

The marginal notes in the Revised Version avoid that ambiguity. "By the devil unto the will of God," referring *αὐτοῦ* to the devil and *ἔκείνου* to God, the literal meaning being "by him unto the will of Him." It is obvious that St. Paul and his amanuensis could not possibly have used different pronouns *αὐτός* and *ἐκεῖνος* of the same subject in the same sentence. "Taken captive by the devil to do the devil's will" is, therefore, an impossible rendering. Much less could it be translated, "taken captive by the devil to do God's will," as that would be an inconsistent and suicidal policy for the devil. Moffatt's rendering: "So they may get back to their sober senses from the snare of the devil, who has captured them to do that devil's will" is, therefore, to be rejected. Alford saw that *ἐκείνου* must be God; but his rendering is wild: "having been taken captive by him (the devil) unto (for the fulfilment of, in pursuance of) the will of Him (viz., God; that Other, indicated by *ἐκείνου*)." As if the devil should pursue the will of God, or his capture of God's people should be a fulfilment of God's Will.

In the next chapter, iii. 9, we have *αὐτῶν* and *ἐκείνων* used in the same way. "As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these withstand the truth, . . . but they will not make further progress for their (*αὐτῶν*) folly will be manifest to all as that of the former (*ἐκείνων—i.e.*, Jannes and Jambres)." This is the usual distinction between "hic" and "ille." See Sallust, "Cæsar . . . Cato, ille . . . hic." Cato is

"hic," the nearer, Cæsar "ille," the more remote. Alford saw this, but he did not understand the passage. Both Bernard* and Newport White† perceived that *ἀνανήψωσιν* must go with *εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα*, "recover themselves out of his snare so as to serve (or 'to do' the will of) God." And yet the expression *ἀνανήφειν εἰς* is too bold even for St. Paul. There may possibly be another word, altered very probably into *ἀνανήψωσιν*, which might logically be followed by *εἰς*. I suggest that that word was *ἀνανεύσωσιν*, aorist subjunctive of *ἀνανέω*, to swim up to the surface, emerge. Compare *ἐκνεῦσαι*, from *ἐκνέω*, swim out, Eurip. *Hipp.* 823: "I see such a sea of troubles from which one cannot emerge" (*ἐκνεῦσαι*); *Iph. in T.* 1186, *ἐς τὸ τῆς θεοῦ γ' ἐξενεύσας*, "took refuge in your duty to the goddess." *ἀνανέω*, lit. to come to the surface, is in Ælian N.A. 5, 20 II./III. A.D. metaphorically to recover; Dio Chrysostom (L. and S.). We have the substantive *ἀνάνεύσις*, recovery, Ps. lxxii. 4, LXX, from the verb *ἀνανέω*. It is also in *Athenæus Mechanicus* (undated), Wescher's edition (26. 2). L. and S. of upward motion (L. and S., 1929). Eusebius (*Præp. Evang.* ii. 264) has the verb, man having tried every experiment, more quickly emerges from his error (*τῆς πλάνης ἀνανεύσας*). Owing to the similarity of the uncials psi (Ψ) and upsilon (Υ) one might easily change ANANEΥΣΩΣΙ (*ἀνανεύσωσι*) into ANANHΨΩΣΙ (*ἀνανήψωσι*). This gives an intelligible meaning to the passage without any unnatural strain like *ἀνανήψωσιν εἰς*. We can render it: if possibly (*μήποτε*, *sæpe* in Philo in this sense) God may grant them repentance so that they may come to the full knowledge of the truth, and may emerge (swim up) from the trap (*παγίς*) of the devil, who have been caught alive (like fishes) by him, into (the open sea of) the Will of God.

The original verb must have denoted *motion*, for the Syriac version has a verb here that means *depart from*—viz., *neprkun*, future Peal of *parak*. We have the same verb and form in 1 Tim. iv. 1, where the Greek is *ἀποστήσονται*, shall depart, and the same verb in 2 Tim. ii. 26, "Let him depart" (*nepruk*), Greek *ἀποστήτω*. The use of this Syriac verb here implies that it represents a similar word to *ἀποστήσονται*, which might well be *ἀνανεύσωσιν*, but could not possibly be *ἀνανήψωσιν*. The Syriac has a verb *yor*, awake, used in 1 Cor. xv. 34, *ἐκνήψατε*, which could have been used here. Again, it is easy to shew that *ανανήφειν* (lit., to recover from drunkenness) (*ἐκ μέθης*, Dion Hal. iv. 35, Porphyry, *De Abs.* iv. 20) met. to recover one's senses, is incorrectly used here, where it follows *μετάνοια*. If perchance God may give them repentance (*metanoia*), so that they may recover their senses (*ἀνανήψωσι*). The correct and logical order would have been so that they may recover their senses and repent. Lucian, *De Saltatione* 84, explains *ἀνανήφειν* as leading to repentance, *ἀνανήψαντα οὕτως μετανοῆσαι*. Ignatius (*ad Smyrn.*, ix.) has to recover one's sense, *ἀνανῆψαι*, and repent, *μετανοεῖν*. Psychologically, one must come to oneself (Luke xv. 17) before one has the change of *mind* that *μετάνοια* stands for. See St. Patrick, *Epistola* 21, "ut Deo resipiscant. ita *ut* vel sero pœniteant" (repentance being the final result of *resipiscere*), and Cyprian, *Epistola* 68, 2, "si resipiscere (*ἀνανήφειν*) et ad sanæ mentis consilium redire vellet, ageret pœnitentiam." So Philo, *De Posteritate Caini*, 178 (Cohn), "if we receive this change and as it were rise to the surface (*ἀνανηξάμενοι*) and lay hold on metanoia." These quotations

* J. H. Bernard: *The Pastoral Epistles* (Cambridge Gk. Test.).

† Newport J. D. White: *Expos. Gk. Test., Past. Epistles*, p. 169.

prove that repentance *follows* the recovery of one's senses, and that the order in the text is wrong.

There are many passages in Philo which support the proposed reading. Although he does not use *ἀνανέω*, he has *ἀνανήχομαι* frequently in the same metaphorical sense. *De Confusione Ling.* 66 (C), "as if his mind was in the very depth of a river, and was not able to swim up and emerge" (*ἀνανήξασθαι καὶ ἀνακῦψαι*)* (of fishes, *Phædo*, 109 [E]). *Quod. Det. Pot.*, 101 (Cohn) i. 211 Tauch.: "his mind is drowned in such a wave that he cannot swim up and emerge" (*ἀνανήξασθαι καὶ ὑπερκῦψαι*). *De Gigantibus*, 13: "They (the souls) having descended into the body as into a river were sometimes carried away by the pull of the current and were drowned, at other times were able to resist the force of the stream and swam up to the surface" (*ἀνενήξαντο*). *De Special Leg.* iii. 31: "To cast me into such a sea of cares in which carried to and fro I cannot even emerge" (*ἀνανήξασθαι*).† Such passages might be multiplied. The Latin *enatare*, swim out, is used in the same metaphorical sense, *e.g.*, Cicero, *Tusc.* v. 30, 87, "reliqui habere se videntur angustius, *enatant* tamen." The others appear to be in greater difficulties, however they emerge from them. Seneca, *Ep.* 22, 12, in a shipwreck, "nemo cum sarcinis *enatat*." Horace, *A.P.* 20, "fractis *enatat* navibus."

Emergere is also used both literally and metaphorically in the same senses—*e.g.*, Terence, "ex illis sese emersurum malis," *And.* iii. 3, 30; Cicero *in Verrem* ii. 1, 5, "emerserit ex peculatus judicio"; *ibid.* ii. 3, 69, "istum ex paternis probris ac vitiis emergere." *De Finibus* iii. 48, "ex alto emergere."

These instances in Greek and Latin of the verbs *ἀνανεῖν ἀνανήχεσθαι* "enatare," "emergere" shew that the idea of swimming out of, emerging from troubles and difficulties, was quite usual. To emerge from a *παγίς*, trap, something fixed that holds fast, is quite a possible expression. In the Anthology (P) the anchor is the *παγὶς νεῶν* (*πήγνυμι*). It is used in a nautical metaphor by Philo. *De Ebrietate* 16 (T), "This is the enemy of the soul putting down baits (*δελέατα*) and *traps* (*παγίδας*) against it, in order that flooded (*κατακλυζομένη*) by the inflowing, *ἐπιῤῥέουσιν*, objects of sense, it may never rise," *ἀνακύψῃ* (word used of fishes rising in *Phædo*, 109 [E]). We have a parallel to *ἀνανεύσαι ἐκ παγίδος* in Philo's *De Agricultura* 103 (Cohn), *δίκτυα ἡδονῆς ἃ πολὺς διεκδῦνας πόνος* (nets of pleasure hard to slip out of). On the other hand, *ἀνανῆψαι ἐκ παγίδος* is impossible, *ἀνανήφειν* being used with *ἐκ μέθης*, recover from a debauch (Dion. Hal. iv. 35). Porphyry, *De Abstinentia* iv. 20: The metaphor in the context appears to be nautical. *ζωγρεῖν*, to take alive, is used in Luke v. 10 of catching fish. In consequence of our Lord's parables (Matt. xiii. 47) on the subject the fish was used as an early Christian symbol. A passage in 1 Tim. vi. 9 resembles the present one and is also nautical in character. "They fall into temptation and a trap (*παγίς*), and many lusts which as you know, drown (*βυθίζουσι*) men in (a sea of) ruin." It is remarkable that *ζωγρεῖν* and *βυθίζειν* are only found in Luke (v. 10, 7) and the Pastorals. Another nautical term in the Pastorals and, like the two previous ones, used in a metaphorical sense is *ναυαγεῖν*

* Philo used *ἀνανήχομαι*, "swim up." It corresponds to *ἀνανέω*, the verb we suggest was used here.

† Plutarch 2. 985 B used *ἀνανήχομαι* in the sense of *ἀνανέω*, and Pausanias used it metaphorically, 7. 17. 1. to recover, *ἐκ νόσου*.

in 1 Tim. i. 19 (only elsewhere in N.T. in 2 Cor. ii. 25): "They have made shipwreck concerning the Faith." It would be more like Paul to make the two principal terms in the sentence, both relating to the same subject, correspond in some way. Now *ἀνανήψωσιν* certainly does not answer in any way to *ἐζωγρημένοι*, "caught alive" (like fishes), whereas *ἀνανεύσωσιν*, "swim out of," has an answering note.

We have now to consider whether there was any necessity for the altering of the phrase *ἀνανεύσωσιν ἐκ παγὶδος*. I believe there was an urgent political reason. It would have looked like an allusion to the attempted murder in a collapsible vessel off the coast of Baiæ, A.D. 59, of Agrippina by her son Nero, when a leaden roof fell upon her companions, a "machinamentum" (Tacitus, A. 14. 6), from which she escaped by swimming "nando evasisse" (Suetonius, *Nero* 34). Both Tacitus and Suetonius describe the affair. Both say she escaped "nando." *ἐκ παγίδος ἀνένευσε* would exactly describe her escape from that "machinamentum." It is well known that Nero was very sensitive of criticism of his actions. It was "taboo" to use the word "matricide." In fact, it was made an act of high treason or *majestas*. Suetonius (*Nero* 39) says he banished an actor, who when acting a farce and saying "farewell, father, farewell, mother" made first a gesture of drinking and then one of swimming, signifying the death of Claudius and Agrippina. "Bibentem natantemque faceret, exitum scilicet Claudi Agrippinæque significans."

There are many instances in Nero's day of writers, or their executors, altering passages to avoid his attentions. Cornutus, the executor of Persius, altered "Midas has the ears of an ass" to "who has not the ears of an ass?" A book of Seneca's, according to Dion Cassius, 62. 25 was corrected before his death lest it should fall into the hands of Nero and be destroyed! Both Nero and Domitian exercised a very strict and jealous literary censorship. Juvenal was punished by banishment to a military post in Egypt because of his satirical strictures on the times.* His reference to the influence of Paris the actor upon the prince in the bold line "quod non dant proceres dabit histrio," vii. 90, being especially mentioned. *Delatores* or spies were everywhere, reporting every word they could hear or read which they could twist into a contemptuous reference to the prince, in order to work up a case of *majestas* or high treason, and to secure an ample reward. The sage Apollonius, a contemporary of Paul, whose *Life* was written by Philostratus, was reported for having said of Nero, "forgive the gods for taking pleasure in *buffoons*" (actors of mimes, like Nero), and was involved in a capital charge for having said before a bust of Domitian in Ephesus: "Fool." Euphrates, a *delator*, overheard him, lodged an *endeixis* at once against him and had him brought over to Rome to stand a trial for *majestas*. Similarly, Alexander the coppersmith lodged an *endeixis* (*ἐνεδείξατο*,† 2 Tim. iv. 16) containing many criminal charges against Paul and had him brought from Troas for trial to Rome. Paul's use of the word *matricide* (1 Tim. i. 9) in a list of vices and crimes, of all of which Nero had been guilty, would have been enough to cause him to lose his head, whereas, on the other hand, Alexander was entitled to a great *reward*. Tacitus mentions the large sums two *delatores*

* See *Life* (by Suetonius?).

† This verb is used in this sense by Plutarch, *Solon* 24, and by Pollux.

received. But as Paul had no assets, the Lord would give Alexander his reward (v. 14)!

Accordingly, such a provocative expression as ἐκ παγίδος ἀνανεύσωσιν would have to be altered, and then someone was struck with the idea that ἀνανήψωσιν (recover from) was a very suitable alternative, being very similar and devoid of all sinister associations—a very simple remedy then, which has caused many serious difficulties ever since to expositors. The passage as amended reads: If possibly God may grant them repentance so that they may come to the full knowledge of the truth, and may *emerge* from the trap of the devil, by whom they have been caught (like fishes), into (the open sea of) the Will of God. Compare Dante, *Paradiso*, canto 3, 35 *f.*:

> " E la sua volontate è nostra pace;
> Ella è quel mare al quai tutto si muove."

(It is the sea to which the whole creation moves.)

F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock

THE CONVERSION OF ST. THOMAS

After consulting some dozen commentaries, three questions arising out of St. John's record of the Conversion of the doubting Apostle seem to me to demand further investigation.

(1) Why did the Apostle demand that he should not only see the wounds but touch them: and not only touch them but put his fingers into the print of the nails, and thrust his hand into the side?

(2) " Because thou hast seen, thou hast believed." What does " seen " mean: mental or simply bodily perception?

(3) " Believed." Believed what?

(1) The peculiar emphasis can only be explained by Thomas' determination to make sure that the wounds were real wounds penetrating the flesh and not superficial scars. But how could they be superficial, when only a few days had elapsed since the wounds were inflicted? Now a superficial wound would be a sham one—that is, similar to those exhibited by beggars in Italy forty years ago, where there must have been a thriving industry for the manufactoring of such things, especially in Naples. Supposing then that Thomas was determined not to be deceived, I suggest that he was on his guard against a possible personification of the risen Jesus. Granting that his mind was of the ultra-cautious type, he would be disposed to imagine that even the empty tomb was no *proof* of a real resuscitation of the corpse. It was not out of the question that someone eager for notoriety might have contrived a " body-snatching," procured the sham wounds and come forth as the Messiah in fulfilment of some mysterious hints given before the crucifixion. In support of this theory it is not necessary to assume that such a plot was probable. It is enough to postulate that Thomas temperamentally disinclined to believe his colleagues' affirmations and, driven into a corner a few days previously to justify his scepticism, was playing the part of advocate of a pessimistic attitude. He would have said, " I don't deny what you say, but you disregard the possibility which can only be disproved by plain evidence that the wounds are counterfeit

and not real." If it is objected that no one would have resisted the evidence which had convinced the others, I would reply that Thomas having once taken up the sceptical position was not to be argued out of it by any easy affirmations that what they all wished to have happened had happened. The general wish would only confirm an honest enquirer in persisting in his scepticism. Even if the others derided the notion of a personification, Thomas would hold to the theory not because it was probable, but because it was possible.

In favour of this hypothesis it should be noticed that it sets Thomas' mind before us in close correspondence with the portrait of the loving, loyal but ultra-logical follower of his Master. It seems improbable that a man so logical should have advanced a markedly illogical objection to the interpretation of the facts to which his colleagues clung. Thomas must have longed to be convinced. He would surely not have hesitated to assent to the new view of things had it not been that his loyalty to truth as he conceived it clashed with his desire to partake of the joy and hope with which the little group was transformed.

At the same time, there must have been in the minds of all, except perhaps John, the same difficulty as that to which Thomas succumbed: namely, that they were faced with the alternative of either realizing that Christ had risen from the grave with a glorified body, a new creation such as had never been conceived or foretold by the greatest of the Hebrew prophets; or to remain tied and bound to an entirely terrestrial view of the Lord's Person—that is to say, to accept the fact of a miracle having occurred, the revivification of a corpse which, though most marvellous, they had witnessed more than once in the time of their discipleship. With the utmost difficulty the others had risen above the earthly view of the Divine action and caught a glimpse of a new form of existence: a human body triumphant over the limitations of space. [In passing we may remark that on the Apostolic grasp of the latter interpretation of the situation depended the whole Catholic conception of the Church as the Body of Christ. The experience through which they were passing formed the groundwork of the Sacramental teaching of Catholicism. Without it Christianity would have been restricted to "the blend of ethics and emotion" to which the message of Protestantism naturally tends.*]

We may be sure that several of the other disciples would have found the acceptance of the glorified body impossible had it not been for the evidence which Thomas had not seen granted by the Lord on Easter Day.

(2) Our last sentence forbids the meaning of the words "thou hast seen" which is vaguely attached to them by most readers: viz., that the mere sight of the Risen Saviour compelled Thomas to believe that the Resurrection was a fact. What he learnt—and this has often been pointed out—was that Jesus must have been invisibly present to hear his own words "except . . . I will not believe." That was a mental not a bodily perception; ὁράω being the verb used, not βλέπω (*cf.* the papyri dictionary). On the perception he based the glorious confession, "my Lord and my God," implying we know not how much of the conception of the mystical union between Christ and the Church: the rudiments of the belief that

* This point, which lies outside my subject, is admirably explained in Mr. C. Dawson's *Christianity and the New Age*, chap. iii.

God's relation to mankind in Christ was to be the relation of an infinite Power transforming the finite.

(3) Thus Thomas realized that the supernatural revelation satisfied not only his longing desire but the demands of his reason. In all growth of apprehension faith leads the way, and reason then justifies the step; all knowledge, as Herbert Spencer said, being a verification of assumptions. Jesus' comment then may be paraphrased: "because your reason has been satisfied, you have ceased to check the action of faith: as long as your faith was held in check you were ἄπιστος. Now you are called upon to become (γίνου)πιστός, a man who accepts the supernatural, and opens his mind to it before his reason is satisfied. For those who allow faith to go before reason are blessed."

E. LYTTELTON.

A PARABLE OF NATURE

HIGH noon had stol'n the sombre garb of night—
A sullen monotone of dismal cloud
That blurred the outlines of familiar sight,
And hid all distance in its darkling shroud.

Lo here, methought, is vision manifest
Of rebel soul (pray God it be not mine!)
Wilfully blind to all that He hath blest,
Forsworn its fealty to the Light Divine.

But see! now here, now there, big raindrops splash,
Then faster, driven by the gale amain,
While lightnings blaze and instant thunders crash,
The shuddering air is pierced by shafts of rain.

And in the storm I saw the passionate tears
Of self-reproach and penitential shame,
God's righteous wrath and man's heartbroken fears—
Fears that were hopeless but for Jesu's Name.

Evening—a scene of beauteous calm and rest;
The storm drawn eastward mirrors to the glow
Of sunset glory flaming in the west
The jewelled splendour of the sevenfold bow.

E'en so the sorrows of a contrite heart,
Touched by the radiance of the Holy One,
Are by His Love made meet to bear their part
In that bright rainbow round about the Throne.

We went through fire and water—but God's Grace
Hath brought us out into a wealthy place;
For look how wide the east is from the west
So far He sets our sins from us: His Holy Name be blest!

J. WYLDE.

NOTE ON ST. JOHN i. 2-4

πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν. ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

I adopt Westcott and Hort's punctuation, which has at least equal authority with that of A.V. and R.V. It has for some time seemed to me that the point of the passage depends on the contrast between that which *δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο*, and that which *γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ*. There is a deliberate antithesis between *διὰ* and *ἐν*. I suggest rendering as follows:

"All things came into being *through* him, and apart from him nothing came into being. That which has come into being *in* him was (*a*) life, and the life was the light of men. And the light (still) shines in the darkness, and the darkness did overcome (or come over, or overtake) it."

To paraphrase the thought at greater length:

"Before the Incarnation the created world consisted of things which came into being through the agency of the Word. But now with the Incarnation something has come into being which is not separate from the Word at all, but, in the language of later theology, is in hypostatic union with the Word. That something is Life, the true life which was born into the world with Jesus. That life in Jesus was the light of men (see John ix. 5, etc.); and, though Jesus died and there was darkness at his death (see Mark xv. 33, etc.), the darkness of night did not really overtake or overcome the daylight. The light still shines in the darkness."

Is there any authority for such a translation and exegesis? And, if there is anything fresh in them, is it worth serious consideration?

OLIVER C. QUICK.

REVIEWS

THOMAS SHERLOCK, 1678-1761. By Edward Carpenter. Published for the Church Historical Society. S.P.C.K. 1936. 15s.

Mr. Carpenter's book is a further welcome sign of the revived interest in eighteenth-century church history, for which, as the opening words of its preface bear witness, we are largely indebted to Professor Norman Sykes. There can be no doubt that the eighteenth century was unjustly treated by the High Church ecclesiastical historians of the last century; it is a common fault to try to enhance the purity of one's own cause by shewing it in relief against an artificially blackened background. We are only beginning to learn that the Hanoverian Age in English religion was not merely one of port and pluralities, and to appreciate its services in the defence and preservation of Christianity. If we may justly consider its faith a somewhat reduced one, we must remember that a beleaguered garrison is apt to lose outpost stations and yet hold the main position. Of the reality of the attack both upon the Faith and upon its institutional framework in the Anglican Establishment, no reader of this life of Bishop Sherlock will doubt. We see him not only in conflict with Deist controversialists and unorthodox clergymen, but as the doughty defender in the House of Lords of what he considered to be the just rights of the Church. It will come as a surprise to many to realize the determined attack upon the privileged position of the Establishment in the early part of the century, and the bitter way in which it was pressed home in such measures as the Mortmain Act, and the Quakers' Tithe Bill. Not the least interesting chapter in the book is that entitled *The Defence of the Church*, which depicts Sherlock as the most effective champion of the Church in Parliament, bringing a legal knowledge and acumen rare in ecclesiastics to bear upon the secularist attacks in devastating criticism.

For Thomas Sherlock was above all a lawyer. The atmosphere of the Temple, where he succeeded his father in the Mastership, was congenial to him, and his years there left an ineffaceable trace upon his character, besides equipping him with no small knowledge of the law. Like Stephen Gardiner, with whom, allowing for the difference of time and environment, a great resemblance can be traced, he tended to look at all

problems from the lawyer's point of view. Whether as Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge defending the constitution of the University, as Bishop of London resisting the claim of the Archbishop to the "option" of the best living in the diocese —a claim which in its gradual growth forms a curious parallel to mediæval papal provisions—or even as Christian apologist, he is always the lawyer. It is no accident that his best known work is the *Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus*, in which the whole argument is put in an imaginary forensic form.

His legal bent largely determined the nature of his political opinions and activity. A Hanoverian Tory, his attachment to law kept him from Jacobitism, though he was often accused unjustly of Stuart sympathies. In reality his Toryism was an anticipation of that of the supporters of George III.; he believed in the balance of constitution and saw as great a danger in a dictatorship of the House of Commons as in an unrestrained royal prerogative, a view he developed in his opposition to the Pension Bills of 1731 and 1740. He disliked the doctrinaire Whiggism which made Locke and the Social Contract its gospel; his mind was above all realist and historical, and Mr. Carpenter not inaptly compares him to Burke. Yet this rather detached attitude of mind prevented him from ever wielding the influence in politics to which his abilities entitled him. Suspected by Walpole as a confidant of Queen Caroline, his later intimacy with Newcastle still did not give him the place in the government's confidence that had been enjoyed by his predecessor Gibson, though his ill health, which made him refuse the See of Canterbury, was largely the reason why he did not play a larger part in the nation's life.

In theology Sherlock stands out as an apostle of common sense. He had no use for the fantasy of "Natural Religion." "No Antiquity affords an Instance of any People great or small, who served God upon the principles of Natural Religion" (quoted p. 239). But he did not consider miracles opposed to common sense; to him they were an integral part of Christian evidences. Nor was he an Erastian. His attitude to the parliamentary attempt to invalidate Scottish Episcopalian Orders will come as a surprise to those who imagine that every bishop of his time was necessarily a disbeliever in Church authority. "Nothing can persuade me that this is not a sort of encroachment upon one of the most essential rights of the Church, which is that of judging what is necessary for giving a man an authority to preach the Gospel of Christ, and to administer the most Holy Sacraments of religion . . . such regulations may be confirmed by Act of Parliament, but like

the other Canons of our Church they ought to take their rise somewhere else" (quoted pp. 85-6).

Space forbids us to indicate the many other interesting aspects of Sherlock's career which are brought out by this very useful contribution to eighteenth-century ecclesiastical history. We commend it to everyone who wishes to gain some idea of the problems which confronted a bishop of the time, and to form a just notion of the Church of the period. As a literary production it could be improved; the arrangement of the matter by topics rather than chronologically is perhaps inevitable, but the way in which it has been done occasions irritating repetitions and cross references and makes it difficult to get an idea of Sherlock's life as a whole. More careful proof reading too would have eliminated not a few roughnesses of style and grammar (*e.g.*, "Archiepiscopate of York" for "Province," p. 211), not to mention mis-spellings (*e.g.*, *effected* for *affected* three times on p. 101). But these are minor blemishes which do not seriously interfere with the value of the book. We hope that Mr. Carpenter will give us more studies of the worthies of a neglected and maligned age.

THOMAS M. PARKER.

NOTICES

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS: ITS SOURCES AND MESSAGE. By V. Burch, D.D. Williams and Norgate. 5s.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has been a perpetual puzzle. Who were these Hebrews? And where did they live? Perhaps, so some have thought, they were not really Hebrews at all, the title having become attached to an anonymous and unaddressed epistle by mistake. As for the writer, it has come to be almost taken for granted that if he were a Jew he was a deeply hellenized one, influenced by thought derived through Philo from Plato. Now Dr. Burch asserts the contrary. The writer was a Jew, writing to Jewish Christians at Antioch. He has no connexion whatever with Philo or with Plato. Nor is he writing theology, framing as it were a stage in Christology between St. Paul and the Logos doctrine. Such thoughts, quite un-Jewish, never enter into his mind, according to Dr. Burch. His central notion was that of the Community, and he writes to those who had become exiles from the old Jewish home, in order that he may establish them in the new home, "the society of believers in the revelation of Jesus." "The body of Christ" is a more apt description of his doctrine than any form of Christology can be.

Our difficulty with Dr. Burch is that he writes in a cryptic style, as if talking to students whom he has taken into his confidence for many years, and who can at once grasp the meaning of his phraseology. Added to this, his habit, imitated from modern "snappy" literature, of writing sentences without a principal verb, increases the obscurity. After a time one gets to know what "the Silent Voices and the lowland ways" (*i.e.*, the pull of the old religion) signify, but unless the reader is attentive and persistent he may easily set the book aside as worthless. That would be a pity. For Dr. Burch is well-read on his subject. He quotes almost everybody, one would think, who has ever written on Hebrews, and he has a competent knowledge of Semitic thought. These qualifications give him at least a title to be heard.

The early existence of a body of proof-texts taken from the Old Testament, *Testimonia adversus Judæos*, is taken now to be a certainty. Did not the writer of Hebrews draw upon that for his quotations and names descriptive of Jesus? Dr. Burch says he did not. His source is the Lectionary of the Synagogue. His work is original, not derivative; and examples in support of his thesis are given. Moses and Melchizedek, and the Maccabean kings and martyrs are alike traceable to the Synagogue readings. Dr. Burch makes out a case which must be considered. A man of the type of Barnabas may have been the author, he says; perhaps even Barnabas himself, although time seems to forbid the idea. Chapter xiii., however, is a difficulty. It is ruled out on the ground of vocabulary and the presence of Timothy's name. Yet the chapter, small as it is, and different in theme from the rest, harks back several times to the wording of previous chapters, and includes the term ὀνειδισμός, and the phrase ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης. Granted, too, that the fundamental thought of the Epistle is Semitic; yet when once a Jew began to write in Greek he could not bar the door absolutely against Greek notions.

The idea that heavenly things are patterns of earthly ones is strongly reminiscent of Plato. Nor does it seem that the substance of what Dr. Burch contends for would be impaired if he admitted as much.

G. W. Butterworth.

The Moffatt New Testament Commentary: The Pastoral Epistles. By E. F. Scott, D.D. Pp. xxxviii+183. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

I cannot express my praise of this commentary better than by saying that it is quite up to the general standard of the series. Dr. Scott holds, and I entirely agree with him, that the Pastoral Epistles as they stand are not the work of St. Paul, though they include some fragments of personal notes written by him. I am inclined to doubt his view that 2 Timothy is nearer to the authentic Pauline tradition; it is no doubt a better and more vivid document, but that need only mean that its writer is a more capable interpreter of the Pauline tradition and a better artist. The reference to Antioch, Iconium and Lystra looks to me like the work of a man who was compiling out of the New Testament and had forgotten that Timothy had shared St. Paul's persecutions. But this is a matter of opinion; on the general question I entirely agree with Dr. Scott. He is quite right in pointing out that *eusebeia* could never be for St. Paul the climax of Christian virtue; he might have reinforced his argument by pointing out that it is the characteristic of the pious pre-Christian Pharisees of the opening chapter of St. Luke—*i.e.*, it is not only in ordinary but also in New Testament Greek that it means being careful in the "observance of all the prescribed rites of religion." But the writer of the Epistles is anxious to secure a general level of moral stability in the young churches. As Dr. Scott points out, they are not for the great mystics; but neither is the Church. The only serious quarrel I have is with the statement on p. 93, that the words "appearance" and "saviour" in 1 Tim. vi. 10 are taken from Hellenistic religion. Josephus and Philo shew that they had already been acclimatised in Hellenistic Judaism as words for describing the "manifestation" of the power of God in the "deliverance" of his people, notably in the Exodus. It is only through this Jewish medium that they come into Christianity, and surely the "husband of one wife" is simply a man who has never been divorced.

But the commentary as a whole is admirable. It is in particular laudably free from the tendency to interpret the ecclesiastical organization implied in the Pastorals in the light of the needs of modern controversy. Yet it is never out of touch with the needs of the modern reader. For the clergy and those engaged in teaching the Scriptures it is exactly the kind of book that is needed for an understanding of the Pastorals.

Wilfred L. Knox.

The Crisis of Christian Rationalism. By Canon K. E. Kirk. Longmans. 3s. 6d.

This book comprises three lectures given at Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford. They are printed almost as delivered, and it may be said at

once that this does not make them any easier. The reader who has to thread his way through a rather intricate argument is apt to be impatient of the number of parentheses, of which there is one on almost every page. In the last essay we encounter (p. 102) the verb "to opt," presumably allied to the noun "option." The title of the book is itself rather difficult, for the term "Christian Rationalism" has to be explained in the sense Dr. Kirk attaches to it—viz., the tendency to water down the supernatural element in religion. These circumstances do not make for easy reading, nor does Dr. Kirk make things easier by throwing off such remarks as "A system satisfies second-rate minds alone." What he is driving at is true and valuable—viz., that Christian thought must not become hide-bound, and that "there must be a divine discontent in our approach to Christianity." But the approach to anything is surely not quite the same as our acceptance of it, and to say that "our religion can only be true to its historic genius if its doctrines are eternally in debate" is misleading. It is doubtless only intended to be provocative of thought, but such phrases are easily misunderstood.

The argument of the first lecture is a cogent and damaging criticism of the Victorian "mental climate," and the type of Christianity which lent itself readily to the evolutionist and "progressive" mode of thought. This is shewn in its final analysis to deny the love of God. The second lecture, on the Militancy of Evil (according to the wrapper) or the Malignity of Evil (in the text), is stiffer. It deals with the problem of "the overplus of suffering"—*i.e.*, the weight of suffering which remains unaccounted for by its educational value, and will not let us dispose of it as "good disguised." Evil is positive. The "immanentist" or Christian rationalist has very little to say about it, but the main stream of Christian thought, which sets store by the divine transcendence, has always emphasized God's intolerance of evil. The Atonement was an attack: "the royal banners forward go." As Professor Kirk says: "Warfare rather than suffering is the essential characteristic of the atoning work of Christ." And he concludes: "We have a manifest duty to be intolerant of evil . . . if evil is real and threatening, it is the Christian's duty, as it was the Saviour's free choice, to wage relentless war against it." This is a bracing treatment of a difficult subject, and should be attentively studied by those who have been brought up to think of the Atonement as suffering rather than offering, and the Saviour as Victim rather than Victor.

The third lecture is a searching examination of the ideas of "duty," "virtue," "happiness," "self-realization," in which the author torpedoes a good many conventions, and reinforces his argument with entertaining examples and illustrations.

M. Donavan.

Modern Evangelism. By Wm. C. Macdonald. Jas. Clarke and Co. 3s. 6d.

The wrapper of this book states that the author's church in Edinburgh is always full. If so, Mr. Macdonald does not possess the power of imparting his secret. The book, written in staccato sentences, is obviously the work of one who is in earnest, but it has little that is new to tell us. The writer indicates that his outlook is a blend of those of Karl Barth

and the French Protestant pastor, Wilfrid Monod. There is a curiously old-fashioned flavour about it. Outdoor preaching is apparently quite a novelty; Mr. Macdonald has only essayed it once. We are glad to note that he advocates it. The present writer, after twenty-five years of it, including such experiences as are furnished by Hyde Park, Leicester Square, and the Birmingham Bull Ring, is of opinion that a real place exists for this work. The Church must go where the people are, but the work must be done by trained speakers, and must not fall under the suspicion of "ranting." Such men as the late Bishop Hough of Woolwich have shewn what can be done where the same speaker presents the Faith consecutively at the same "pitch." Here Mr. Macdonald's evangelism would stop short; he would not use the Apostles' Creed (p. 61) on the ground that its recitation is apt to become formal, but he does not hesitate to invent a new evangelical creed which, presumably, would be immune from this danger! He is generous in his acknowledgment of John Wesley's great work, but is apparently unaware of any other Church revival in England. The penultimate chapter, on Evangelism and Social Reform, gives the impression of being tacked on because the subject is "in the air." Readers may be grateful for Mr. Macdonald's sincerity, but there is not much to be learned from his pages.

M. Donavan.

The Apocrypha. By R. H. Malden. Oxford University Press. 4s. 6d.

A republication of a course of six addresses delivered at Wells Cathedral last Lent. The first three are very discursive, but eventually the lecturer warms to his subject, and we can well believe that his hearers were stimulated to a thirst for further knowledge of what, to the man in the pew, are only too truly still the Hidden Books.

Stephen L. Caiger.

Excavations and Protosinaitic Inscriptions at Serabit el Khadem. (Series VI. of Studies and Documents edited by Kirsopp Lake and Silva Lake.) By R. F. S. Starr and R. F. Butin. London: Christophers. 15s.

Excavation in the Sinaitic Peninsula has not quite the same thrill for Biblical students as it had in the days of Sir Flinders Petrie's researches in Sinai nearly forty years ago. It was then hoped that at any moment the spade might turn up relics of the Israelites' forty years' wandering in the Wilderness, and one inscription was actually claimed as the signature of Moses himself. Modern scholarship tends to locate the Mount of God among the volcanoes on the Arabian side of the Gulf of Akaba, rejecting the very late identification of the Peninsula with Sinai or the route of the Exodus.

Nevertheless, interest in the Serabit inscriptions has been revived by the recent discoveries at Gezer and Tell el Duweir of a kindred script. It will be remembered that Petrie saw in these crude protosinaitic inscriptions nothing less than the birthpangs of the alphabet, the missing link between the picture-writing of Egypt and the simplified Phœnician script

from which all the alphabets of the ancient world were derived. Moreover, this primitive alphabet was the invention of Semitic (Hebrew ?) workmen engaged as quarrymen in the turquoise mines of Serabit by their Egyptian masters at a time far anterior to Moses.

It was the purpose of the Serabit Expedition of 1935 to investigate these claims still further, and to complete the excavations. The present volume is the official Report of this Expedition. It is definitely, of course, a publication for the expert, consisting of those meticulous plans, measurements, and scientific photographs which have made the modern archæologist a model for all time of painstaking and dispassionate accuracy. The object of the Report is rather to present the evidence than to interpret it, but the following deductions are allowed to emerge: some of the remains are undoubtedly Semitic; they are even older than Petrie supposed; the script, though still undeciphered, is almost certainly alphabetic. Nothing in the excavations throws any light upon specifically Hebrew history or religion.

STEPHEN L. CAIGER.

IN PURSUIT OF PERFECTION. By Sybil Harton. Mowbrays. 5s.

The multitude of books on the subject of prayer and the interior life of the soul today is amazing. This implies that there is also a demand for them, and a much more serious effort to know the things of God than is generally supposed. Every parish priest knows, or should know, that, though his congregations may be smaller than in the days when he began his ministry, or in the days when he was himself taken, willy nilly, to church because everyone else went, there are many more who are desiring to be religious and seek his aid in this matter through his administrations. Mrs. Harton now adds her book to meet the demand of such souls, and she has written a most useful book for the purpose. The Bishop of Bristol writes in his preface that it is "full of sanctified common sense," and he is right. She avoids the technical language that makes many such books useless to the ordinary reader. In her own introduction Mrs. Harton describes the crowds that gather at the cinemas, the football matches, the Albert Hall, and speaks of them as lumps waiting for the leaven of saintly lives. This leaven is being produced at a greater rate than is imagined. People are reading religious books with the purpose of finding out the way to a spiritual life. Such knowledge has been kept too long as the treasure of the elect, but now the ordinary Christian is pressing into this kingdom and claiming his share in it. It is not impossible for a ploughman to be a contemplative, and the more the experts can hand over their knowledge in a language that the people can understand the more leaven there will be. It is often in this way that God prepares the way for another Pentecost. So we are indeed grateful to Mrs. Harton for her wise and helpful book, and hope it will have a wide circulation.

W. E. LUTYENS.

SOME ASPECTS OF CONTEMPORARY GREEK ORTHODOX THOUGHT. By F. Gavin. S.P.C.K. 10s.

When these "Hale Lectures" were first published in Milwaukee, 1923, it was soon recognized that they opened up new windows to Anglican

theology in revealing some of the teaching of the modern Greek Orthodox theologians, and were specially valuable on that account. They sold well, and have been for some time out of print. It is a gain, therefore, that they are now reissued by S.P.C.K. It is not a new edition in the sense of being revised or augmented, but is photographically reproduced. The six lectures of which it is composed cover the whole ground of a general handbook of theology. The contemporary exposition of the Greek theologians is one that is full of modern life and interest; and not least interesting when it brings out to light certain variants of theological thought and emphasis. Now that Dr. Gavin's able description is again available, it ought to have a very wide sale wherever Anglican thought is alert and alive.

WALTER FRERE, *Bishop.*

THE RELEVANCE OF THE IMPOSSIBLE. An Interpretation of Christian Ethics. By Reinhold Niebuhr. S.C.M. 6s.

This invigorating book will compel most readers to think out anew their position in the field of social ethics, and few will be able to reach again the same conclusions that they held before Dr. Niebuhr took up his valiant stand on the side of prophetic religion. That is not saying that every reader will reach the same conclusions as Dr. Niebuhr, but whether he be orthodox or liberal, fascist or communist, isolationist, League of Nations man, or pacifist, he will receive a good shaking up, and feel all the better for it.

The argument that is fundamental is that the ethical teaching of the Gospels is perfectionist, and therefore impossible of application except in the Kingdom of God. It is emphatically not interims-ethics, but is exclusively eschatological. This does not mean, however, that the Christian ideal is irrelevant. On the contrary, the Christian ideal is the absolute by reference to which every act and every policy must be judged. But so judged, all moral action and every moral agent must stand condemned. That is the tension at the heart of all prophetic religion. God is both creator of a good world and judge of an evil world. The religious soul is at the same time both filled with despair and inspired with hope.

The disastrous fallacies which vitiate so much Christian thought and Christian action are: either to assume that the Gospel ethics are perfectionist and therefore impracticable; or to assume that they are applicable to life in this world and are therefore not transcendent values. The one alternative condones social evils, the other takes a sentimental view of the perfectibility of human nature. The right course, according to this book, is to adopt a pragmatical ethic for application to affairs and reserve the perfectionist ethic for judgment upon all agents. To introduce perfectionist principles into the discussion of policies is culpable dishonesty.

To give one example: Dr. Niebuhr is, apparently, an advocate of peace, but he is not a pacifist on any ideal grounds such as the Sermon on the Mount, but on exclusively pragmatical grounds. He would not condemn war because it is sinful but because it is silly. Peace is just as sinful

as war but is not so stupid. Perhaps this crude way of putting the matter misrepresents the dialectic of prophetic religion, but such seems to be the deduction to be drawn.

The perfectionist ethic is relevant to all the problems of our times, not because it gives us any guidance for the direction of our social mechanisms, but because, when rightly understood, it constrains us to seek and use the moral machinery which will best serve the social good. We cannot apply the perfectionist law of love. Sin, which seems to be identified with egoism, makes this impossible. But the absolute perfection of the love ideal constrains us to promote social justice and equity by the use of political, economic and legal machinery. In this connection coercion by force is necessary, and therefore justified by the end which is served. The constraint to make use of the machinery without which the moral good cannot be made will lead to the redistribution of property on Marxist lines. Practical morality of this character is obligatory, but it cannot be deduced from the ideal.

It is not enough to set up ideals and assume that we needs must carry out the highest when we see it. Radicalism and Rationalism ignore the need for a moral dynamic to drive mankind through social compulsions towards the moral goal. They also, together with all sentimental religion, ignore the evil in the world and in the heart of man. Goodness may be on the increase, but evil is increasing at the same time. Dr. Niebuhr does not mention Zoroaster, but it may be safely assumed that he would have nothing but admiration for his moral dualism. If the nineteenth century believed in a law of social progress, the twentieth century may be inclined to compensate by positing a law of social deterioration. A prophetic religion, however, dispels both the optimism which forgets that men are sinners and the pessimism which forgets that the Lord remaineth a King for ever. God's in His heaven; but notwithstanding, all's wrong with the world, and the immediate prospect for vile man is not here presented in pleasing colours.

There is so much arresting and original thought in this book that no brief notice can do justice to the ramifications of the argument. Some of the branches the readers will want to lop off in order to graft in others. For instance, many will disagree with what Dr. Niebuhr says in disparagement of sacramentalism and mysticism. These developments of the religious life may not be essential to prophetic religion, but they may nevertheless be authentic in their place. What their place should be in relation to prophetic religion the reader must think out for himself. It is significant, however, that only a weak link connects the Christ of experience with the Jesus of history. Evidently the fact of the Incarnation does not fit in well with this system of ethics. If that fact were made central there would be a basis for both sacramentalism and mysticism. Moreover, that fact firmly established as historic, there would be no need to make rather dubious use of religious "myth." But these weaknesses in the book are irrelevancies to the main theme, which is a valuable contribution to religious realism.

The virtues of prophetic religion are contrition and gratitude. The reader cannot fail to feel both contrite and grateful when he lays down this book.

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

BUILDING FOR GOD IN AFRICA. By Godfrey Callaway, S.S.J.E. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

MARK NAPIER TROLLOPE: BISHOP IN COREA, 1911-1930. By Constance Trollope. S.P.C.K. 6s.

Fr. Callaway has worked in Africa for over forty years. No missionary of the Anglican Communion has a better right to speak of building for God in Africa; for he has grown up with St. Cuthbert's Mission; and St. Cuthbert's is perhaps the best example of the type of mission which fits in most congenially with the needs and the temperament of the black millions of Africa. It is paternal and tribal in its spirit.

Furthermore, Fr. Callaway, in previous writings, has shewn himself a master in the art of literary silhouette. His black figures live, and his little sketches of native life and character are unsurpassed for their simple naturalness. But it is one thing to do sketches, and another thing to paint history on a wider canvas. It is not Fr. Callaway's fault if he has not been equally successful in this latter task, for he makes it clear in his preface that he has been persuaded to attempt something alien to his special facility—"you have fed us with little biscuits, but now what we want is substantial food."

This is not to say that the book is uninteresting; it is full of flashes of revelation and insight. The story of blind Dosini, the thread upon which the incidental and bright beads of the history are strung, is in itself a fascinating biography.

But reminiscence is not history; neither is it biography; and there is a great deal of reminiscence in Fr. Callaway's book which can only be interesting to the old men who are his contemporaries. It is difficult for the ordinary reader to attach much importance to the question, discussed at great length, as to the respective parts played by Mhlontlo and Mditshwa in the murder of Mr. Hope at Sulenkama in 1870. Much has happened since 1870; and where is Sulenkama? The lack of a map in this book is inexcusable.

Miss Trollope's "Life of Bishop Mark" is on quite a different level. With admirable restraint she lets a very great man reveal himself through his letters and other writings, and his speeches. There is no gentle meandering of reminiscence. Trollope was up against problems which are the problems of today; and his policy is a matter of vital interest in every part of the mission field, as well as the home-base. The book is brimful of applicability, redolent with contemporaneousness.

No student of missionary enterprise can afford to neglect it; and none will regret looking at the tremendous problems of the Church Militant through the eyes of so clear-sighted and forceful a personality as Mark Trollope. He went to the root of everything he tackled. He had no use for mere palliatives; and compromise was alien to his nature. In a characteristic utterance, after stating the truth about the indissolubility of Christian Marriage, he says: "If this view is objected to as narrow, I can only suggest in reply that the Gospel itself contains some very pertinent remarks on the comparative value of broad and narrow ways."

Pioneer work can only be done by men of conviction. And the Church in Corea was fortunate in having as its master-builder a man who was a saint first, a statesman second, and politician not at all. There are few more romantic countries than Corea. But it is not only the

country that makes the story of the Mission in Corea so interesting; it is also the men who served in it, and the impact of their work on the history which is being made in such a hurry in the Far East. All this is brought out with a penetrating tenseness in Miss Trollope's book; and we are left with a fascinating vision of a very big man playing a very big part in very big events—a Christian undaunted amid catastrophic changes.

ARTHUR W. HOPKINSON.

DER URSPRUNG DES MÖNCHTUMS. By K. Heussi. J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen. M. 8.60.

A new full-length monograph on the origin of monasticism was overdue, and Professor Heussi by his many years of intense study was admirably fitted to write it. In spite of the voluminous literature on the subject a perfectly objective book is hard to find. Protestant writers for the most part cannot put aside their prejudices, and Catholics by a natural reaction tend to defend the indefensible, by emphasising the favourable features.

Heussi summarises previous literature, gives a very thorough account of second and third century asceticism, and then describes Antony, Pachomius, and in particular the primitive strain of thought preserved in the *Apophthegmata Patrum*. The sources are two-fold: first, the continued influence of the original eschatology, secondly extra-Christian influences.

True monasticism began when the pressure of persecution, which compelled Christians to hold together, relaxed, and the ascetics were enabled to form their own separated life in cell or cenobium. Though complete withdrawal from the world is impossible, the anchorite takes into the desert that realm of thought which has been formed by life in the world. Primitive Christianity was necessarily world-forsaking, because eschatological. The story begins significantly with John the Baptist. While the 144,000 virgins of Rev. xiv. are a dream-phantasy, so large a number would not have been used if ascetics at the time had been few. The particular form taken by asceticism in the second and third century, namely "spiritual marriage," was dictated by the sacred prostitution from which it was a reaction. Monasticism proper, in the next century, with its separation of the sexes, was a natural development from the abuses of the earlier system.

Scholars have been slow to admit external influences because they have held to the outworn dualistic conception of sacred and profane history. History, in fact, is one continuous stream in which sacred and profane are inextricably mingled. The religious comes to its own; Heussi will not accept the materialist explanation of economic causes. Neoplatonism may have contributed, but monasticism proper is a native Egyptian product. Manichæanism and Buddhism (the former was strong in Egypt, the latter was introduced by commerce with India) were added to the continuing eschatological motive.

A reading of this fine book corroborates the view that historic Christianity is indissolubly related to Mediterranean culture. The native Egyptian contribution here depicted is so bizarre that one can be thankful that monasticism is hardly known to us in the West except through the

channel of the Benedictine Rule, which introduced Roman order into formlessness, and eliminated Eastern elements of doubtful value.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

The Ethiopian Church. By Dr. De Lacy O'Leary. S.P.C.K. 2s.

There are many books on Abyssinia but few deal with the history of the Abyssinian Church. The present work gives a useful account of the Church of Ethiopia from the time of its foundation by Frumentius in the fourth century. Frumentius was consecrated in Alexandria, and the Church of Ethiopia continues to receive its Abuna from that see; it has remained subject to the Coptic Patriarch of Alexandria up to the present time. This accounts for its separation from the rest of Christendom, for it repudiates the Greek, Latin, and every Church which accepts the decisions of Chalcedon of 451.

The services of the Ethiopian Church are of great interest to liturgiologists. Its liturgy is derived from the Greek liturgy of St. Mark of Alexandria. It is in the Ge'ez language, imperfectly understood by the clergy, who, for the most part, are poorly educated.

In the sixteenth century the Portuguese made a treaty with the King and sent their missionaries to work in the country. Eventually a Uniat Church was formed, which lasted about a century. The movement was not popular, and a reaction came with a new king in the seventeenth century, who drove out the Jesuits and proclaimed the dependence of his church on the Coptic Patriarch. It is to these Portuguese missionaries, notably Alvarez and Bermudez, that we owe most of our knowledge of their church customs.

There is an interesting account of the reign of Lalibala (1200-1230). In his day, at Lasta in Tigré, were formed the ten celebrated rock churches which form the most remarkable monuments in Ethiopia; they are of Christian origin and designed for Christian worship. King Lalibala became a national hero, famous for his wisdom and piety, and is now revered as a saint.

Of the future of Ethiopia no one can prophesy. Everything depends on the policy of the Italian Government. The whole country is by no means conquered, although the capital has fallen and the Negus is in exile. The treatment meted out to Ethiopia has been cruel and barbarous. Our author says it need not be "an unmixed disaster for the Ethiopian people, least of all for their old and venerable church." Many will not agree with this concluding sentence of his book.

The future of the Church depends on the power of the clergy to resist attempts at Latinization which are sure to be made in the future, unless there is absolute religious freedom granted by the Italian Government.

F. N. Heazell.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher